LIBRARY OF CONGRESS.

Chap. ..... Copyright No. .....

Shelf BX1770

L28

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

NATIONAL DANGER IN ROMANISM

OR

RELIGION AND THE NATION.

BY

REV. I. J. LANSING, A.M.,
AUTHOR OF "ROMANISM AND THE REPUBLIC."

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
COPYRIGHT
JAN 25 1894
CITY OF WASHINGTON.

ARNOLD PUBLISHING ASSOCIATION.
BOSTON, MASS.

COPYRIGHTED.

THE LIBRARY
OF CONGRESS
WASHINGTON

TO THE READER.

BX1770
.L28

WE send you this address, one of twelve, in the hope that your interest will be awakened in this effort to bring to the light the Romanism that boldly, by its most trusted leaders, declares its purpose to capture this country for the Papacy, and couples its word with a determined effort to undermine and destroy our Public Schools; to have Parochial Schools, under some guise, supported by the State; to obtain the public moneys for its various institutions, and in general to corrupt and weaken our distinctively American and Protestant life by entering as a Church into Municipal, State, and National Politics.

Read the titles of these patriotic addresses, and then —

1. Send us a silver dime for any two of them, as sample copies, or

2. Send us the names of five to ten persons who believe in our Public School System and in the American Idea of Separation of Church and State, and no appropriations for Sectarian Institutions, or

3. Avail yourself of one of our Special Offers, or subscribe to the Envelope Series, and so help us to scatter these clean, strong, reliable publications all over our land, this Columbian year, when every effort is being made to glorify the Church that has cursed Europe for twelve centuries under the name of Christianity with the most unspeakable despotism known to history; and

MAY GOD SPEED THE RIGHT.

RELIGION AND THE NATION.

I WISH to speak to you this afternoon on Religion and the Nation, and I have chosen three texts from the Holy Scriptures which show their relationship. In Psalms xxxiii. 12 we read, "Blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord; and the people whom he hath chosen for his inheritance." In Psalms xxii. 28, "For the kingdom is the Lord's: and he is the governor among the nations." While in Matthew xxviii. 19 our Lord says, "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations."

The star of Bethlehem is no more the adequate symbol of Christ's presence in the world. For one radiant point, shining out into the gloom of night, is not sufficient to indicate the diffused light of his presence who came to be the Sun of righteousness. To-day the fitting type of Christ, in the world, is the radiant sun, as he mounts toward the zenith, illuminating every place and disclosing everything upon the upturned hemisphere. So Christ and Christ's truth are not to be directed merely to minute personal affairs, but are to be applied in the largest way to matters of the greatest magnitude. Therefore it is that this day, in a land whose birthright I would not exchange for a birthright in any other nation under heaven, and in concord with the Christian Church,

which has attained a purity and efficiency exceeding that of any former time, in harmony with teachers who, on this holy day and every day, plead for truth, I lift my humble voice to make some application of the religion of Jesus Christ and of the truth of God to the affairs of this nation.

By religion, I mean the great principles which relate to God and his law and to the human soul in its deepest convictions, acts, and necessities. By the nation, I mean that organization of men which, under the divine law, as a civil state, has to do with the moral and temporal welfare of humanity, which renders progress possible, which protects the weak, which upholds all virtue, and seeks the common good. To be more specific, when I speak of religion and the nation, I mean to speak of the religion of the Lord Jesus Christ: that religion which we have from the Holy Scriptures, which tells us of God and of Jesus Christ his Son, who came into the world to save sinners; that Gospel which teaches us of the Holy Spirit and of right dispositions, which tells us that a human character should bring forth, as fruits of the Holy Spirit, "love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, meekness, faith, and temperance;" that religion whose law is, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself;" that religion whose trinity of graces is faith, hope, and charity; that religion whose law of human progress is that we should "add to faith virtue, and to virtue knowledge, and to knowledge temperance, and to temperance patience, and to patience godliness, and to godliness brotherly kind-

ness, and to brotherly kindness charity." And of that religion I speak in its application to this nation — to this nation with its marvellous physical configuration, with its wonderful origin, its equally remarkable colonization, its institutions, and its struggles. So, then, to apply the religion of Christ to the United States of America, in which we live, and to show its relation thereto, is my purpose.

I. And the first proposition which I present, as worthy of your attention, is this: THAT RELIGION HAS A VERY INTIMATE RELATIONSHIP WITH THE NATION.

1. In saying this, I but quote the opinion of the fathers and founders who laid the corner-stone of this government. This is not an atheistic State, and never will be till it is totally changed from its earlier and present conditions. In the cabin of the Mayflower the Pilgrim Fathers, on the 11th of November, 1620, entered into this voluntary compact: "In the name of God, amen: We, whose names are underwritten, the loyal subjects of our dread sovereign King James, having undertaken, for the glory of God and advancement of the Christian faith, and honor of our king and country, a voyage to plant the first colony in the northern parts of Virginia, do by these presents, solemnly and mutually, in the presence of God and one of another, covenant and combine ourselves together into a civil body politic, for our better ordering and preservation and furtherance of the ends aforesaid: and, by virtue hereof, to enact, constitute, and frame such just and equal laws, ordinances, acts, constitutions, and offices, from time to time, as shall

be thought most convenient for the general good of the colony. Unto which we promise all due submission and obedience." "Here," says Bancroft, "was the birth of popular constitutional liberty." The founders of this country were devoted to religion; were seeking "the glory of God and the advancement of the Christian faith."

In the writings of the fathers and founders of the republic, there has been a most constant recognition of these principles. In their confession of the divine presence and the divine guidance, there is an accordance as of the Psalms of a nation. The recognition of the origin and continuity of the nation in God is repeated in the inaugurals of the Presidents. The words of its great citizen, Franklin, which reached to the foundations of political thought, in the most critical hour of the convention of the representatives of the people for the formation of the constitution, were as follows: "We have been answered in the sacred writings, that except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it. I firmly believe this: and I also firmly believe this, that without his concurring aid, we shall succeed in this political building no better than the builders of Babel." President Washington said in his first inaugural, "No people can be bound to adore the hand which conducts the affairs of men more than the people of the United States." Thomas Jefferson, often misquoted as an unbeliever, said at the close of his inaugural, "I shall need, too, the favor of that Being, in whose hands we all are, who led our fathers, as Israel of old, from their native land, and planted them in a country flowing with all

the comforts and the necessaries of life; who has covered our infancy with his providence, and our riper years with his wisdom and power, and to whose goodness I ask you to join in supplications with me." The last inaugural of President Lincoln shows that the preserver of the republic was no less devoted to God than its founders. Its whole thought was gathered up in the recognition of One whose judgments are true and righteous altogether. And the words of Gladstone, and Disraeli his great antagonist, representatives of our great mother nation, are a like expression of the truth, that the foundation of constitutional liberty in Great Britain, as the foundation of the national life of these United States, is laid in firm and devoted recognition of religion.

2. Such is also the truth of the Holy Scripture, as I have read it in these texts, which are merely selected from hundreds of others. A holy nation was chosen first, out of all the peoples of the earth. Its prophets and preachers were statesmen and diplomatists; its principles were principles which every student of political life tells us are the most fundamental to the welfare of any and every state. No nation has ever existed on the face of the earth that took better care of the poor, that provided better for the welfare of the people at large, that afforded greater liberty, than the state of the Hebrews in the early centuries. Our Lord recognizes the same great truth when he sends his disciples to teach the nations; to not merely teach individuals, but to saturate society with his truth. What we find, therefore, in revelation confirms the opinions and actions of the fathers of

this republic, and assures us that in the divinest ideal of the State, religion and the nation are very closely allied.

3. When we come to consider certain great facts in the history of this nation, they can never be separated from religious considerations. Suppose for a moment we survey the marvellous territory on which we live, comparing it with Canada, or Mexico, or South America, or any European land. If a man has any conception of Providence, if he believes at all in the ordering hand of God, as did Franklin, Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln in the above quotations, he must think that only divine providence could have preserved this marvellous virgin continent for a nation, singular and unlike all other nations in its foundation, in its purpose, and hitherto in its progress. Separated from all neighbors who might contend against us, with treasures the vastest and most wonderful, with every facility. to grow unhindered, we have here an evidence of that divine goodness which seemed to reserve for constitutional liberty and human development the fairest portion of all the earth.

4. When we reflect on the foundation and birth of this nation, we perceive that it was born of conscience and of religious faith. Whether we behold the English Pilgrims, who came from over the sea to our shores that they might have freedom to worship God, and to found a free church in a free State; whether we consider the Dutch, who confirmed the principles of liberty and gave its institutions to our Pilgrim forefathers, and who laid the foundations in New York, of a State like that which they had wrested from

Philip the Second and the Duke of Alva; whether we observe the genial spiritual graces of the soul in the reverent and peace-loving Quakers who in Pennsylvania reared a State which, at its beginnings, was essentially religious; or dwell on the Swedes in Delaware, the English in Virginia and Georgia, and the Huguenots in South Carolina, — the whole line of these early colonists, who, fleeing from superstition and oppression in the Old World, made of their lives the beginnings of this republic, is a line radiant with conscience, glorious with piety, splendid with faith.

5. Not only is this true, but it is also true that the institutions which have been founded in this nation are peculiarly related to religion in their character and purpose.

Remarking on the institutions which make us a nation, I should name first a free church in a free State, existing without the trammels of civil authority. I should comment on a free school, which cannot be thought of without a free church: no free school, no free church; no free church, no free school. I should speak of that remarkable symbol of pure democracy, the town meeting, which is more really democratic than almost any other organization that we have known in the political history of our land. These institutions of our country, all standing around and defending the home, seem to possess in their nature the essential necessity of religion. Where else but in religion did our fathers get the idea of free thought, free conscience, free discussion, free intelligence, free education, and pure morality?

6. The struggles of this nation have been likewise

very largely efforts that had a peculiar religiousness in their character. Our wars have not been for conquest of territory, or for the overthrow of other states. At first our fathers, in the colonial days, contended for their homes against the Indian and the French. Later the Revolutionary struggle was with Great Britain for the right to a free manhood, a religious principle of which the Bible is full. When in 1812 there was another contention with Great Britain, it was in order that American men on the seas might be as free as American men on the land. And when finally there came the fearful burden and struggle of civil war, it was once more the birth-throe of liberty, that we might be rid of the curse, which, despite our Declaration of Independence and our Constitution, had come upon us in the form of African slavery. So the struggles of the nation seem to me to be very intimately related to religion, and to arise from noble rather than from selfish principles.

7. But further than this, there is, as I may say, a soul in every nation. Until you have travelled to foreign parts, and know the difference with which men regard the government in other lands and in this, you cannot realize what it means to be an American. There is a moral purpose in a nation, a moral life, a moral drift, a moral thought. I almost said there was a soul in a nation. And if there is, the soul of this nation is essentially moral and religious. If I were to ask what is the leading thought and purpose of America, I should find it in that text around the old Liberty bell, which rang on the first Fourth of July, whereon you read, "Proclaim liberty throughout all the land

to all the inhabitants thereof." The thought of America is the thought of humanity; the largest privilege for man under law; the protection of the weak, the uplifting of the lowly, universal benevolence. Friends, there is a ground-swell in America, which, as the feet of men from other shores touch our soil, lifts them. (Applause.) They who have come from afar have felt this, and know that it is true. The moral trend and purpose of this nation is so distinctively religious that it may be said we cannot think of the nation as divorced from religion.

8. But there is another view of this same truth which impresses me profoundly to-day: that is, that the perils of our country are equally the perils of religion; that the enemies of our country are equally the enemies of true religion; that the antagonists of the United States of America are just as much the antagonists of the Christian Church in the broad sense of the word Christian.

I think that I can show this very plainly, and that the proposition, though it may seem startling, can be proven exactly true. Find me a foe of this nation to-day, anywhere, and I think I can find you in that same foe the antagonist of the religion of Christ. There is a linking and blending together of religion, not the church as an organization, but religion and the nation, such that their enemies are identical. You can understand that there may be a state, a nation, which true religion would antagonize. I should say, for instance, that true religion in Russia would be in antagonism to the present tyrannous form of government. You can understand that there

may be a state so vile, and in it a religion so false, that the two are mutually destructive, and that the destruction of either is no loss to mankind. But assuming that the religion of the Lord Jesus Christ is the best religion of the world or the ages, I think it is plain that whatever is antagonistic to it, and at the same time antagonistic to this nation, is not good in itself nor good in its influence.

In illustration and proof of this I ask: What are some of the manifest foes of this nation to-day, which make us tremble when we think of our country's future?

I may not name those which you regard as the most important, but let me mention three or four.

1. An evident foe of this nation is drunkenness and the liquor traffic. I speak of this not in detail, but in the broadest aspect. As a producer of crime, where it has a dreadful supremacy; as a creator of vice, where it has unparalleled power, — it is more than manifest that drunkenness and the liquor traffic are hostile to the nation. If crime is a nation's enemy, if vice is a country's curse, then the traffic which creates them is equally so. Also from the standpoint of economics and wealth, drunkenness and the liquor traffic are foes of the nation to this extent, that, as Gladstone says, more than war or pestilence or famine or all combined, they have impoverished society.

From the economic standpoint this foe is everywhere destructive. There is not a man who by drunkenness lowers his own ability for production and his own capacity for consumption, but what by

just so much diminishes the nation's wealth and his own. And we know that this curse does both.

Moreover, as related to politics, the saloon is governing cities so far, and cities are governing the State to such an extent, that we all see there is peril here. When the votes of drunkards control America, her doom is sealed. As you observe, therefore, this antagonist, this foe which strikes every holy thing in the nation a deadly blow, which debases every man and woman and child, every institution and interest, who is not impressed with the fact that it is at the same time the antagonist of the Christian religion? Is there any doubt in the mind of any person here that among the most pronounced of the hindrances and foes of Christianity, the church, and virtue is this same traffic?

2. Another of the perils of this nation to-day is from unrestricted immigration. Everybody is thinking about it and talking about it more than they have at any time since you can remember. We all recognize the desirability of having multitudes of men come from other lands to develop the enormous resources of our country. There is room on our vast areas for hundreds of millions of souls. We want America for Americans, but we want Americans for America just as much. (Applause.) We want people here who are the right kind of people, fit to be citizens. But it is noticeable that of the 430,000 immigrants who came into this country at the port of New York last year, and of the five and a quarter millions who have come in since 1881, there are many wholly unfit for citizenship in the United States. So low

has the quality of immigrants fallen that many of our thoughtful people are saying, that we have become the dumping-ground of Europe. *The New York Sun* of Dec. 31, 1891, says that a hundred thousand of the people who landed at that port alone last year ought to have been sent back on the steamers that brought them.

Two weeks ago to-morrow I read in a New York paper that on the day before twenty-one Italian criminals had landed there at one time, of whom two were murderers, the others all convicts; and although the two murderers had been arrested, even they were likely to be permitted to stay. Now, add to this the fact, which is very well known, that these immigrants furnish so large a preponderance of the criminals and paupers, and you can see how dangerous is this immigration to America. I find that Frederic H. Wines, who is the special agent and expert appointed by the Census Bureau of the United States on Statistics of Paupers and Crime, quoted in the *North American Review* for April, 1892, says that of the 43,000 penitentiary convicts reported June 1, 1890, whose birth and parentage are known, one-third were foreign born, and a great many more were born of foreign parents on these shores. While numbering less than one-sixth of the population, the foreign born furnish one-third of the criminals in penitentiaries. The Secretary of the Department of Public Charities and Correction of the city of New York says that "the superintendent of the workhouse expresses the opinion that 90 per cent of the native born committed are the children of foreign parents, and doubtless

this is true of other institutions." This is an ominous showing, making nearly two-thirds of our criminals of immediate foreign extraction. We dwell upon it to make perfectly clear that if people so vicious and so incapable are brought here and are naturalized and begin to govern America, they are a great menace to the nation.

Now, I ask you is it not equally true that these same undesirable and degraded immigrants to whom I have referred are the enemies of true religion? Where is the New England Sabbath since they came here? and where is the public virtue in municipalities as compared with former days since these became the makeweight of our national politics? I have no hesitation in saying that to-day the adamantine wall against the progress of the Christian Church and Christian morality in this country is very largely the foreign people, with ideas immoral and dangerous. And I am amazed that when this is the fact we do not dare to carry the truth of God to them for fear that their tyrants, clerical or political, will not like it, and may curse us for so doing. (Applause.)

3. But again, another of the antagonists of America, which at the same time is an antagonist of true religion, is corrupted politics. Well may we awaken and look about us to see how dangerous a foe this is. When selfish politicians for mere gain, and political rings for mere plunder, are controlling so many of the municipalities of this country, well may we awaken and reflect. Take, for example, the city of New York, our metropolis, great in numbers and great in wealth, but the shame of America as she

stands to-day in the political world. When an eminent clergyman, a month and a half ago, lifted up his voice in the Madison Square Presbyterian pulpit in New York City, and denounced the government of the city of New York as a government of thugs, thieves, and criminals, declaring that the worst thing you could say of them was to write their actual history, and that this would be dangerously near to obscenity, many of the conservative pulpits and the conservative people wondered that Dr. Parkhurst allowed himself to be so sensational. Some of the newspapers abused him, Tammany Hall threatened him, the Grand Jury reproved him. He waited, collected overwhelming proofs, and a month from that time, in his pulpit and before the Grand Jury and the public, not only verified all that he had said and demonstrated it, but much more. And this one man has done more to scare the dive-keepers and the criminals, the gamblers and the prostitutes of New York than all their police for the last twelve months. The Grand Jury since then declare that the whole police force of New York City is bribed by criminals with from seven to ten million dollars a year. What the brave minister said was true. When I speak of corrupt politics, what more need I say to those who love their country than that to-day, by the verdict of a prominent non-partisan committee of the Bar Association of the city of New York, it is averred and proved that the man who has lately been appointed to be a judge in the Court of Appeals of the State of New York, the highest court in the State, is at this present moment deserving of State's Prison for a crime against the election laws,

and is in his present position as a reward from the Governor of the State for the perpetration of that crime. If there is any deeper damnation for corrupt politics than this, where will you find it? When the judiciary of great States, governors and senators, the police and the executive of the great cities of this country (for how much better is Chicago, and how much different are Boston and Brooklyn and Baltimore?) — when these have been made thus corrupt, may not the nation recognize in them the most dangerous perils from political debauchery? But are not these at the same time the antagonists of true religion? Can you imagine true religion in unity with this type of debauchees? Can we not agree with Dr. Parkhurst when he says, speaking of his own work, "From the very commencement of my ministry here, I confess that to be of some encouragement and assistance to young men has been my great ambition. There is little advantage in preaching the gospel to a young man on Sunday if he is going to be sitting on the edge of a Tammany-maintained hell all the rest of the week." In harmony with this truthful and sagacious utterance, I am ready to say that if all the preachers in this country would let alone metaphysics for a week, all the 'isms and 'ologies, take off their coats and pitch into the scamps, official and otherwise, in our communities, they would do more to save the young men than by any other process I can think of. (Applause.) Not that I think the ministers ought to become police, but I think we ought to have relief from the curse of utterly shameless, selfish, demagogic politics, even if ministers have to accomplish it. (Applause.)

4. Again, a great enemy of our country is illiteracy, and it is not more an enemy of the nation than it is of true religion. You know that a very large number of people have come to these shores who cannot read and write. Many of them are voters, and enough of these cannot read their ballots, so that in their ignorance their votes are bought and sold like sheep in the shambles. An ex-president of the Board of Education of New York city says: "Four-fifths of all our criminals are uneducated. It costs $29.40 per annum to educate a child in a grammar school in this city, and $110 per annum to maintain a criminal in the penitentiary." It is cheaper to educate him, is it not?

There is a very close and dangerous relation between illiteracy and crime — a relation generally known and conceded.

Dr. William T. Harris, United States Commissioner of Education, in an address on "Compulsory Education in Relation to Crime and Social Morals," says: "Statistics collected by Dr. E. C. Wines show that in France the number of persons under arrest from 1867 to 1869 was 444,133, of whom 442,194 were roported as unable to read, making over 95 per cent. Of the illiterates there was an average of one arrest for each 41 persons, but only one arrest for 9,291 persons who could read." While this seems too large a disproportion for America, yet all agree that compulsory education does act as a preventive of crime.

The illiterate are the prey of every vice. They are endangered by every temptation, as those who are

educated and trained cannot be: and of them there is a host in this country.

Do you not see that this foe of the nation is also hostile to true religion? Is there any harmony between true religion and mental stagnation? Is not the whole spirit of the Old and New Testaments the spirit of a new intellectual as well as spiritual birth? Does not true religion offer itself to us in a Book that needs to be read, and is not one of the first duties of Christianity to teach a man to think, to acquire information, to study, and to reason? Surely this is as true as any axiom.

I have thus shown that religion and the nation are very intimately related, because the foes of one are the enemies of the other. I come now to apply this principle to a form of religion which claims the right to control this nation.

II. *The Roman Catholic, or Papal, Church in the United States of America is in league to a large extent with these foes of the nation, and therefore should not be permitted to govern this country as it proposes to do.* Of the Roman Catholics of this country as individuals, I speak with entire respect: many of them are noble and pious people, better than their creed. I do not denounce them personally, nor bear them any ill-will, but I speak of the system at large when I say the ecclesiastics of the Roman Catholic Church in this country are claiming America, and I am here to enter my protest and to say that their claim ought not to be allowed.

1. Now, first, they claim it. Let me give you a few facts to certify to this. There is a book, a souvenir

of the Baltimore Congress of the Roman Catholic Church, entitled "Three Great Events in the History of the Catholic Church in the United States," published in Detroit, Mich., and which contains the addresses made on the occasion of the Congress, of the Centennial Celebration, and of the dedication of the Roman Catholic University in November, 1889. Here are some of the statements made in those addresses: "It can hardly be doubted," says Dr. Brownson, who writes the introduction, "that this is destined to be a Catholic land." Bishop Ireland says: "A magnificent future is before the church in this country if we are only true to her and to the country and to ourselves. Our work is to make America Catholic. Our cry shall be God wills it, and our hearts shall leap with crusader enthusiasm. We know the church is the sole owner of the truths and graces of salvation. The conversion of America should be ever present in the minds of Catholics in America as a supreme duty from which God will not hold them exempt. The importance of the possession of America to the cause of religion cannot well be over-estimated. The church triumphant in America, Catholic truth will travel on the wings of American influence. The American people made Catholic, nowhere shall we find a higher order of Christian civilization." "Why, the broad seal of the Catholic Church is stamped forever upon every corner of the continent," says Daniel Dougherty, their great lawyer orator. This, of course, implies right of possession. Edmund F. Dunne says: "Why, then, should we not love this land? Is it not ours? Is it not Columbia, daughter

of Catholic thought, of Catholic wealth, of Catholic courage? Is not the whole country really a Catholic land, and is it not under the care of Catholic saints? Are not their holy names borne by more than three hundred American cities?" And so on. These are only samples of the all-pervading sentiments endorsed repeatedly by that great representative Roman Catholic body.

2. And now, ladies and gentlemen, I raise this question: What is the relation of the Roman Catholic Church, as such, to each of the four enemies of the American nation of which I have spoken — drunkenness, undesirable immigration, corrupt municipal politics, and illiteracy?

If they claim America, are they right in that claim? Are they the people in whose hands the future of America should lie? Are they friends of the nation, or in league with its worst foes?

3. What is the relation of the Roman Catholic Church at large, to drunkenness and liquor-selling? The relation of their people, many of whom are very unfortunate in this respect, to the curse of strong drink is well described by one of their priests, the Rev. M. F. Foley of De Land, California, who writes in the *Catholic Mirror*, which is Cardinal Gibbons's own paper. He says: "Go into our prisons, our reformatories, our almshouses; go into our great asylums where numbers of children are being reared, in what must necessarily be a hot-house atmosphere, to face the storms of life. Go into the crowded tenements of our great cities, into their lowest dens and dives; see the misery, the squalor,

reigning there; see the men and women, low and besotted; see the little ones dying as flies in the fetid air, or, worse, living to poison the nation's moral atmosphere; in a word, see degradation in its most repulsive forms. In these abodes of crime, of poverty, of misery, you will find thousands of Catholics. Ask what has brought to prison and almshouse, to reformatory and orphanage, to dive and brothel, so many children of the Church. Trumpet-toned comes back the answer: 'Drink, drink.'" Thus he says, and very eloquently, that many of them are the victims of this dreadful traffic. But, says one, there are temperance societies among the members of the Roman Catholic church which are doing an excellent work. Concerning these societies, I quote still from Father Foley, in the *Catholic Mirror*, when he says: "What is the attitude of Roman Catholic young men on the temperance question? This is important, as the future of America is in their hands — one of such grave importance that I give the following statement. The following resolution was twice voted down by the Catholic Young Men's National Union, which held a convention recently in Philadelphia: 'Resolved, That the Catholic Young Men's National Union, viewing the saloon as pre-eminently the source of evil to young men, use its utmost influence, and urge upon the societies connected with it to use their utmost efforts, to prevent Catholic young men from visiting saloons. And also to discountenance by all means possible the drinking customs of society."

"That resolution was deliberately and decisively voted down twice in the Catholic Young Men's

National Union." In other words, not to read what he very fully explains, their National Temperance Society did not and would not say that they discouraged young men from going to the saloon or drinking. Temperance men they are, so they claim. Then why would they not endorse this resolution? What kind of temperance men are those who will not oppose the saloon? I ask further, what other church than the Roman Catholic Church would have done what they did when their great cathedral was building in New York, before it was dedicated, when dramselling on a very large scale was permitted and encouraged in that house in order to make money to finish it?

I do not desire to lay upon them any greater responsibility than should be put there; but I ask this other question: Has the Roman Catholic Church ever struck the saloon as it has struck the common schools? (Applause.) Has it ever threatened to take away the sacraments from the people who frequent saloons or sell liquor? It has done that with reference to the common schools. Why not the saloons? Do they hate free schools more than saloons? The attitude which they hold toward their people is such that probably, if excommunication or withholding the sacraments were threatened, they might keep them out of the saloon; but it has never been done. Now this I say before this community and before this intelligent audience: If that church has power to protest against and smite the liquor curse and does not do it, it is because it is in sympathy with it in some way or other. Who sell the liquor mostly in

in this city and elsewhere? What names mostly are on the saloon signs? (Sensation.) Are these liquor-sellers in good standing in that communion? Could they be in any other? If not, I raise the question why is it that this mighty ecclesiastical organization has not taken the stand which that resolution which they voted down in their temperance society took in reference to the saloon? The friend of the liquor traffic is not the friend of this nation. (Applause.)

4. But again, as to the immigration that is coming to this country, and which is so very undesirable; where does it come from?

When I look over the list of immigrants, and I have several lists here indicating the nationality of those who come to this country, I ask myself, who of these are dangerous to the country? Are they the immigrants who come from England, from the north of Ireland, from Scotland, or from Sweden, Norway, and Denmark? Are these the most undesirable immigrants we have? Or are we most afraid of the immigrants who come from Italy, from Bohemia, from Poland, from Hungary, from Austria, from France, from Ireland, from the Province of Quebec? Which do we think of as being more dangerous to our civilization? Which furnish the paupers and criminals in such large proportion? Now, you know, and everybody knows who knows me, that I have positively not one particle of dislike to a man of any nationality; I care not what his color is, or of whom he was born, or where he saw the light, or whether he has a dollar or a million; a man is a man for all that. But I want to know this, where do the immi-

grants come from who are so imperilling America to-day?

You know the answer as well as I. Almost all these immigrants whom we fear were under the absolute dominance of the Roman Catholic Church in the lands where they formerly lived, and a very large share of them are its superstitious devotees to-day. Hungary is Roman Catholic; Austria and Poland also; Italy, though it is fast drifting into infidelity; Ireland, except Ulster; France and Quebec. And we know that when these people come here they are fleeing from tyranny — a tyranny which their own church has fostered in those lands; but when they are here they are the people whom we wish had not come, unless they are going to be different from what they were at home. Not because they are Roman Catholics, not because they are of this or that nationality, but because they are dangerous to intelligence, virtue, sobriety, and liberty. (Applause.) These papal peoples are not good enough to rule America. (Great applause.)

5. I proceed to raise another question. Municipal misgovernment is an antagonist of our country. Has the Roman Catholic Church any relation to this municipal misgovernment? I return again to the city of New York as an illustration and answer. Almost every officer of that city is a loyal devotee of Rome. On the 2d of last March the birthday of Leo XIII. was celebrated, and the mayor of the city of New York was present in his official capacity. When Archbishop Corrigan came in, the mayor, Hugh J. Grant, fell on his knees, in the presence of the audi-

ence, before the archbishop, and kissed his hand in token of reverent submission. The executive head of the city of New York thus did homage to the archbishop. The real mayor of the city of New York is Archbishop Corrigan. (Sensation.) And when Dr. Parkhurst scourges Tammany Hall, he lays his lash almost every time on the backs of the adherents of Archbishop Corrigan and the Papacy. (Great applause.) Twenty-five years ago there were six adherents of the Roman Catholic Church in the city council of Boston; to-day I believe there are about fifty. Is that government purer to-day than it was then, or otherwise? I say calmly and truly that if the Papists of this country and the questions which they bring into politics were out of politics, we should have scarcely any difficult problem in the politics of our Northern States. It is the truth — you know it is — the living truth, that this corruption came in with them, and that they fatten on it. Surely such politicians are not fit to control this nation. (Applause.)

6. Now, finally, take the matter of illiteracy. When these illiterate people come to the United States, one would suppose that everybody who has a spark of humanity or patriotism would try to educate them. But first I want to know where these people come from, how come they to be illiterate, and how are they going to get the ability to read? I hold in my hand a little book in which is a table furnished by the Bureau of Education of the United States. It gives a list first of eight Roman Catholic countries and then of eight Protestant countries. They have

just about an equal area in square miles, and just about an equal population, 148,000,000 in one case, and 149,000,000 in the other, and what is the fact in regard to relative illiteracy? In the Roman Catholic countries sixty out of every hundred cannot read and write; in the eight Protestant countries only four out of every hundred people cannot read and write. That is to say, the proportion of illiterates in those Roman Catholic countries is fifteen times as great as in those Protestant countries. These are official figures, and indisputable. Does this mean anything to you? Does it not suggest a potent cause of illiteracy?

When the Roman Catholic Church boasts of its educating, I allow that the education of the aristocracy has been an object of their attention in all European countries; but show me the country where they have educated the common people, either in Europe or on the Western Continent? When these people come here we suppose that they come because our country is more desirable than theirs. What has made it so? We should therefore suppose that the Roman Catholic hierarchy would do its best to make our free schools influential to lift up these illiterate and teach them to read, as it has our native population. On the contrary, while Rome furnishes us a very large preponderance of our illiterates, she is the only force in these United States that openly, defiantly, and continuously fights our free schools. (Applause.) The only one!

She says America is hers, puts forth the most strenuous efforts to grasp and to hold it; but if I understand the truth, the church whose relation to the liquor traffic is too largely of toleration and com-

plaisance, if not positive support; whose relation to undesirable immigration is such that she to a great extent monopolizes it; whose relation to bad municipal politics is such that she has to be allowed a most disgraceful prominence; whose relation to illiteracy is such that she furnishes most of the illiterate immigrants, and at the same time she alone antagonizes the free common schools, which are the only agency that ever made the common people able to read, — I say, when I hear her claim, and note the facts, I protest that this papal church is not good enough to control America. (Continued applause.)

COLUMBUS AND AMERICA.

"BEWARE of false prophets." So speaks our Lord, in Matthew 7th chapter, 15th verse.

"Beware of false prophets." Why? Because they tell lies. Because they tell lies in the name of religion and of God; for the office of the prophet is to speak forth and teach the word of God. No man can do as much harm as he who utters falsehood in the name of religion, for thereby he appeals to the highest, most responsive sense in humanity, namely their religious sense; and if through this they are deceived, men are carried farther astray than by any other faculty or teacher. Therefore Christ, knowing that the greatest possible disaster comes through religious teachers who, in the name of God, wilfully state what is false, warns people in that age, and in every age, to beware of them.

Scarcely less should we beware of those who tell us falsehood as though it were history, who looking backward, as the prophet looks forward, recite as though it were fact, romance and fiction as the annals of a past time. For the history of past times is highly important as teaching us how to live in the present; and of all the gifts of God to human intelligence, few are more useful than a knowledge of

the past. Great deeds of former centuries thrill us, in our own age. The patriot of to-day fights his country's battles with Leonidas in the pass of Thermopylæ, with Charles Martel on the fields of France, with the heroes of Bunker Hill and the defenders of Lucknow. The Christian starts and thrills again as he seems to stand beside Stephen defying the council, Paul before Agrippa, Savonarola before the tyrants of Florence, intrepid Luther in the Diet of Worms, or Cranmer at the stake holding his right hand in the fire.

So important is truthful history in the inspiration which it gives to us of the present time, that false allegations, told as though they were history, may lead a nation and a generation astray. Everywhere the Old Testament lays great stress on the importance of Israel's past history as a corrective and guide of their present conduct and policy. That keen observer and great statesman, Bismarck, is often quoted as saying that the saddest thing he saw in France in 1870, was the false teaching of history in the schools of France by clerical teachers, because he knew that it was but sowing dragons' teeth, which would in the end bring sorrow to a nation.

There are people who are afraid of true history; and when you find any so afraid, it is because they are consciously building on falsehood, and are afraid the error will be disclosed. The struggle in the Boston public schools over Swinton's history was ominous of the great fact that clerical usurpation, like civil usurpation, cannot stand on truthful history, and is always afraid to have it taught. This

is the chief reason why history is not taught in the national schools of Ireland, and accounts for the clerical protest against it.

In presenting to you for your consideration statements which are to no small degree historical, I am moved thereto by the claims of certain representatives of Papal Rome, who, in considering the discovery of this country by Columbus, base on that discovery claims which are false in history and false in their forecast. And this I undertake to do because I do not know who will tell you unless I do here, to beware of these false prophets who are endeavoring to subvert the future of America by inventing a false history of her past.

We are in the four hundredth year since Christopher Columbus sailed from Palos and discovered the little island of San Salvador, and afterwards the larger islands of the West India group. Already this great historical event has taken a fresh hold upon the public mind, and is stirring popular sentiment. Recently this platform has been occupied by those who have lauded and honored the illustrious name of Columbus. Already the nations have interchanged courtesies with reference to celebrating the finding of the New World; and we of the United States have named what promises to be the greatest of all the exhibitions of human art and handicraft in the history of mankind, the Columbian Exhibition. So important is this fourth centennial, and so great is the notice which it attracts, that it cannot fail to have a powerful influence upon the sentiments of our population and upon the history of our nation.

I. Romanist Claims.

On the fact that Christopher Columbus was a Roman Catholic have been based, by certain of his co-religionists, some very extraordinary claims.

1. We have been told that he was a pious Catholic, and that his crew were Roman Catholics, that the sovereigns who favored his expedition were Roman Catholics, that he came here for the planting of that faith, and that he here celebrated the rites of that form of worship. In connection with these statements we are further told that the cause and reason of the finding of the New World, and of all its subsequent great development, was Catholicity, that is, the Roman Catholic system. We have further been told that the consequences which have followed from the discovery of the New World and the founding of this great Republic of the west, are due entirely to Catholicity, as they call Romanism, and the inference has further been drawn, that because of these alleged facts, the Roman Catholic religion has certain rights in this country which no other religion has, and that by right it ought to control our territory and our people, because that territory was originally discovered by the representatives of that faith. That you may see that I have not overstated these claims in the slightest degree, I shall quote from an eminent representative of the Roman Catholic Church, his exact words, delivered under such circumstances as to have received practically the in-

dorsement of the whole Roman Catholic Church in this country.

2. In November of the year 1889, at the Congress of the Roman Catholic Church held to celebrate its centennial in the city of Baltimore, where the principal prelates and most distinguished laymen of that church were present, Daniel Dougherty, Esq., known throughout this country as a brilliant and eloquent orator, made a speech by invitation, in the presence of the Congress, which received their fullest indorsement. Mr. Dougherty not only uttered the sentiments above outlined (which I am about to quote from the memorial volume published by the Roman Catholics on that occasion), but in the midst of the greatest enthusiasm, after he had spoken, he received a vote of thanks from the assembly. You therefore see that they practically adopted his words as their own. Mr. Dougherty says, "The shadow of an imposing event begins to move. The people of the United States, ay of the hemisphere, are about to celebrate the 400th anniversary of the discovery of America. We heartily rejoice in this resolve." That tremendous event, — with reverence I may say the second creation, — the finding of a new world, and the vast results that have flowed to humanity, can be traced directly to the Roman Catholic Church, and the Roman Catholic Church alone. Protestantism was unknown when America was discovered. Let the students and scholars search the archives of Spain and the libraries of Europe, and the deeper the research, the more glory will adorn the brow of Catholicity. It was a pious Catholic who conceived the

mighty thought. It was when foot-sore and down-hearted at the porch of a monastery, that hope dawned on him. It was a monk who first encouraged him. It was a cardinal who interceded with the sovereigns of Spain. It was a Catholic king who fitted out the ships. It was a Catholic queen who offered her jewels as a pledge. It was the Catholic Columbus and a Catholic crew that sailed out upon an unknown sea, where ship had never sailed before. It was to spread the Catholic faith that the sublime risk was run. It was the hymn to the blessed mother that each night closed the perils of the day and inspired with hope the morrow. It was the holy cross, the emblem of Catholicity, that was carried to the shore and planted on the new-found world. It was the holy sacrifice of the mass that was the first, and for long years the only Christian worship on this continent. . . . Why, the broad seal of the Catholic Church is stamped forever upon the four corners of the continent!"

3. For these statements and these claims, with more like them, and equally felicitous in expression, Mr. Dougherty received the thanks of the Congress.

Moreover, the Roman Catholic papers with which I am familiar, for the last year have reiterated over and over again the same declarations, claiming that Romanism deserves the glory for the finding and founding of this continent, and that it therefore has superior rights of recognition and control. Their design is evidently to impress the millions who follow their standard, not only with the greatness of their church and their system but also that they have

the right of dominating the territory and the peoples of this nation. It is, therefore, eminently desirable that we should get a full and correct idea of the history to which they refer. In the spirit of the best historical writing which is now coming into vogue, which is properly supplanting the romance that is sometimes substituted for history, and by the aid of the latest searchers of the original sources of information and truth, I undertake to analyze, and I may so far premise as to say dispute, the statements above made, and the inferences drawn by the Papacy and its representatives.

II. Claims Reviewed.

Let us contrast with the facts, the statements of the orator which have been read in your hearing.

1. I might say, however, before that contrast is begun, that if all that Mr. Dougherty said were proven true, I cannot see that the just inference would be that the Roman Catholic Church of right ought to control this country. Suppose we should say that some hundreds of years ago the Toltecs occupied Mexico, and that portion of territory now known as New Mexico, in our own country: then that the Aztecs, another race, came down from the north and discovered the Toltec country; therefore, by right, the Aztecs and their descendants forever ought to rule over the land which they discovered. Would that be good reasoning? I think not. And yet the Aztec civilization in Mexico was of an order to rival that which was brought thither by Cortez and the

Spanish Roman Catholics, after the discovery of America by Columbus.

2. Mr. Dougherty says that all the glory of this country can be traced directly to Catholicity and the Roman Catholic Church, and to the Roman Catholic Church alone. Now, I should like to inquire what in the Roman Catholic Church it was that inspired Columbus, whether it was their polity or their faith? And studying the institutions that have grown up in this country, I beg to ask whether our free civil constitution sprang out of the Roman Catholic Church, either its polity or its faith? Where is there any analogy to the free constitution of this republic in any of the doctrines or any portion of the polity of the Roman Catholic Church? If we, a republic of such magnitude, have been born of the Roman Catholic faith, it is marvellously strange that no other republic in all history was ever born of that church, Every effort of the South American and Mexican peoples to become free republics she has opposed, and the Roman Catholic Church to-day is the most dangerous foe of those republics, and of our own, though they claim that she gave them birth.

3. And what idea of Christopher Columbus did we owe to the Roman Catholic Church? He believed that there was a passage westward to Asia, but that belief was shared by Aristotle and Strabo and Seneca two hundred years and more before the Christian era. He believed that the world was round, and yet we find the Pythagoreans teaching that the world was round, six centuries before Christ. We find that Aristotle taught it four centuries before Christ. We

find that Cicero the orator, and Pliny the historian, and Ovid and Virgil the poets, of an era contemporaneous with the birth of Christ, all believed that the earth was round. We find, moreover, that two hundred years before the Christian era, Crates formed a globe ten feet in diameter, to show the sphericity of the earth. Now, I do not suppose that even Mr. Dougherty would claim Aristotle and Pythagoras and Cicero, Pliny and Ovid and Virgil, Crates and Seneca, as Roman Catholics. Perhaps that is a little beyond even his extraordinary power as a claimant.

4. He says that Protestantism at that time, that is, in 1492, was totally unknown. It is a fashion for Roman Catholics to say that Protestantism had its birth at the time of Martin Luther; and if they define Protestantism as beginning with Martin Luther, of course they will have to say that there was none before. But surely the apostolic church was not Roman Catholic, and most surely from the beginning of its usurpations until now, there have been millions who have entered their protest against the assumptions of the Papacy. "Where was your church before the days of Luther?" asked a Papist of a Protestant. "Where yours is not now, in the word of God," was the ready answer; and a truthful answer it was. The assertion of Mr. Dougherty and Roman Catholics that there was no Protestantism at or before 1492 is monstrous in the light of history.

In 1329 the people of the city of Frankfort-on-the-Oder resisted the Papacy and their ecclesiastics, until they were put under the ban of excommunication for twenty-eight years. Were they not Protes-

tants? Abelard and the University of Paris two centuries before that entered their protest against the usurpation of Rome, both in theology and government. The Waldenses, named from Peter Waldo, who died in 1179, have always been the objects of Roman Catholic hatred and persecution, as was their founder, because of their love of a purer faith. Surely 1170 is somewhat earlier than 1492. Wickliffe, "the morning star of the Reformation," was born in 1324, and was sufficiently obnoxious to the Roman Catholic Church, so that a hundred years afterward, in 1428, the ashes of this man who loved the Bible and hated the Pope were not permitted to rest in their grave, but were taken up by priests, and scattered in the river Swift, thence passing by the Avon and the Severn to the sea. Was this indignity put upon his remains because he was a Romanist or a Protestant? Chancellor Gerson, a great light of the Middle Ages, one of the greatest names in the history of France, struck with all his might against the errors and assumptions of the Papacy. Savonarola uttered his protest in Florence, and was burned in 1475, seventeen years before Columbus discovered America: he was the representative of a very large following. (There might have been more Protestants in those times if there had been fewer inquisitions, dungeons, and stakes.) Dr. John Lallier of the Sorbonne, a man of most distinguished ability, gave his utterance against the Papacy in 1475, and was burned in 1498 for stating what he did. I wish I had time to read you all that he said. Let me read a few words: "All the clergy have received

equal power from Christ. The Roman Church is not the head of other churches. You should keep the commandment of God and of the apostles; and as for the commandments of bishops and all the other lords of the Church, they are but straw. They have ruined the Church by their crafty devices. The priests of the Eastern Church sin not by marrying, and I believe that in the Western Church we should not sin were we also to marry." Is that Papist or Protestant doctrine? But this man was turned to ashes in 1498 by the fires of Papal Rome. John of Wesalia died in a dungeon because he uttered his sentiments concerning Rome in the following manner: "He whom God is willing to save by the gift of his grace will be saved, though all the priests in the world should wish to condemn and excommunicate him. And he whom God will condemn, though all should wish to save him, will nevertheless be condemned." Is that a Roman Catholic or a Protestant declaration? John Wessel, who, on account of his great learning, was called the "Light of the World," born probably in 1400, long before the time of Columbus, gave utterance to sentiments even stronger than these when he says, "Nothing is more effectual to the destruction of the Church than a corrupted clergy. All Christians, even the humblest and most simple, are bound to resist those who are destroying the Church. We must obey the precepts of doctors and of prelates only according to the measure laid down by St. Paul (1 Thess. v. 21), that is to say, so far as 'sitting in Moses's seat,' they teach according to Moses." And he utters

another sentiment which I must read. Hear him: "The Popes may err. All human satisfactions are blasphemy against Christ, who has reconciled and completely justified the human race. To God alone belongs the power of giving plenary absolution. It is not necessary to confess our sins to the priest. There is no purgatory unless it be God himself, who is a devouring fire, and who cleanseth from all impurity."

All this antedates Columbus. So also Bohemians had sent missionaries before the discovery of America, into many countries of Europe to carry the doctrines of Wickliffe. The Protestants in many lands out-numbered the Papists, and in those lands the inquisition had no force, while the Greek or Byzantine Church, and the old Armenian Church, a little farther east, never bowed their neck to Rome, even when monarchs undertook to force them to do so.

These are but a few of hundreds of facts of history concerning the Christians who have withstood Rome. In view of these, when a speaker, in the presence of an intelligent American audience, says that there were no Prostestants and no Protestantism prior to 1492, either he does not know history, or else he intentionally deceives. It is true that there was always the most determined effort on the part of Rome to crush by her tyranny and persecutions those who protested against her: it is true that the stake and the flame were everywhere. John Huss was burned in Constance in 1415; so was Jerome, soon afterward. I have stood beside their monuments, where they were tortured to death by the Romish

Council of Constance seventy-five years before Columbus discovered America. Is Romanism Christian which deals thus with preachers of a pure Gospel? Nay. Nor could she, even with the bigoted fierceness of past or present times, suppress the truth which she hated.

5. Columbus, says the orator, was a pious Catholic. That is true: he was. He desired a crusade: said he was going to get wealth in the New World in order to carry on a crusade in the Holy Land; and in the latter part of his life he claimed to be inspired, and to be fulfilling the vision of the apocalypse as one whom God had sent to take the Holy Sepulchre.

6. He says that a monk befriended him (at the monastery of Santa Maria de la Rabida). That is true; but it is also true that many men went into monasteries in that time in order that, hidden from persecution, they might dare to think without the likelihood of being slaughtered for their opinions. No doubt many a man of great ability sought refuge there in order to find quiet and to save his life.

7. A Catholic queen, he says, pledged her jewels. This is a romantic invention, for history discredits it wholly, since her jewels were probably already pledged for the prosecution of the war against the Moors.

8. He says it was a Catholic crew that sailed with Columbus. Perhaps you know the fact that he got many of his crew out of the prisons, because other sailors would not embark. Nevertheless, I do not know that being in prison is to their discredit,

because a good many most excellent men were put in prison in those days, by the Roman Catholic Church; and although these were prisoners, and came out of the penitentiaries that they might sail with Columbus, it does not follow that they were bad men. However, if they were good Catholics, then they were bad men, else they would not have got into jail; if they were good men, it was because they were Protestants, and put in on account of their faith. (Applause.)

9. He says that the purpose of Columbus was to spread the Catholic faith; but as I read with extremest care the history of Columbus, I find that his cry everywhere is not for the conversion of the natives, but for gold — gold — gold. I hold in my hand an abstract given by Washington Irving, and repeated by Mr. Justin Winsor in his recent "Life of Columbus," of the agreement entered into by the sovereigns Ferdinand and Isabella on the one hand, and Christopher Columbus on the other. Not a word is said in it about the salvation or conversion of the natives: it is all about the honors which Columbus shall acquire, the proportionate part of the treasure that he shall have and that the monarchs must receive as a return for his possible discoveries. I will not stop to read, for fear of wearying your patience, the four distinct statements to the above effect which are made in this agreement.

When the New World was found, everywhere the cry of Columbus and the men with him was for gold; so that, as says Benzoni, the contemporary historian of the voyages, "at length the natives used to take

up a piece of gold and cry, 'Behold the Christians' God.'" This was the idea which they received of the piety of Columbus and his followers. When Columbus undertook to place on the neck of a chief in the West India Islands the cross as the sign of the Christian faith, this poor man had seen so much of the cruelty of the Spaniard, that he declined to take it, on the ground that it represented tyranny and cruelty. Such was the idea the natives received of the faith of the explorers and conquerors.

Thus all the statements of the distinguished orator, before the Catholic Congress, I have passed in review, and you see in the light of history about how much truth there is in them. Only the least important of his allegations are facts.

But let me proceed to his claims and inferences with farther facts.

III. Rome desires the Entire Credit and Responsibility of what Columbus was.

This is their demand: Catholicity did it all they say. Catholicity made him what he was, therefore Catholicity is responsible for all that he was. Very good, so be it. What was he? that is the question. Now I am going to tell you some facts from his biography.

1. Before he came to Portugal, his history is uncertain. But in 1484 Columbus married in that country a woman of excellent character, so far as we know, whose father and grandfather were persons of some distinction. Columbus deserted this woman

and her children, taking with him only one of them, his son Diego, when he went to Seville. He never saw her again, and did nothing for her support. He himself says, if his own word can be trusted, in a letter which he wrote in the latter part of his life, as much as I have just now stated.

2. He barely escaped arrest at the frontier, when he left Portugal, because of some unknown crimes which he had committed. What those offences were we cannot tell; but we do know that the king of Portugal on the 20th of March, 1488, wrote him a letter saying that if he would come back, the crimes of which he was guilty would not be charged against him, whatever they were. In 1487 Columbus, the pious Catholic, took for a mistress Beatrix Enriquez, and she bore him a son Ferdinand, who is one biographer of his father. This woman also he shortly forsook and left without support. All that Columbus was, Mr. Dougherty says, is due to Catholicity, and all that he did sprang from that Church. Let us inquire farther.

3. A reward of ten thousand maravedis and a silken jacket was promised to the man that should first discover land on the earliest voyage of Columbus. It is the opinion of the most careful biographers and historians, that land was first discovered by a poor sailor, and that Columbus claimed and took the reward, in violation of every principle of honesty. Moreover, it is in harmony with the well-known avarice and cupidity of Christopher Columbus that he should do that very thing. There is a painful story of the poor sailor who was cheated of the

deserved reward, that he afterwards joined the Mohammedans, hoping to find in the followers of the false prophet a degree of honor that he had failed to find in the followers of the Pope. (Applause.) All that Columbus was, he was made by Catholicity, says the Catholic Congress, indorsing its orator.

4. But he had scarcely landed in the West Indies, before he proposed to enslave the natives of those unfortunate islands. Queen Isabella was somewhat opposed to this, and resisted it for a time; but it was not long, because enslavement was urged again and again in the letters of Columbus, before five hundred of those natives were sent as slaves to Spain. He sent five ship-loads at various times, and was the father of the slave-trade in North America. Untold horror and inhumanity resulted, carrying with them an awful infamy for Columbus. To prove that Catholicity did it, such were the sentiments of his time, that Las Casas, a noble Roman Catholic priest of great humanity and of true piety, says that the priests, the large share of them, and the most prominent, were in favor of the enslavement of the natives, and that they co-operated with Columbus in bringing it about. (Sensation.)

5. Moreover, cruising along the southern coast of the island of Cuba, Columbus took it into his head (he was a man of extraordinary imagination) that he would assert that he had found the continent of Asia, and he therefore compelled all his sailors and officers to swear that they had seen the continent of Asia, under the following penalty: if the sailors ever denied that it was the fact, they were to

have their tongues torn out, and if the officers denied it, they were to be fined ten thousand maravedis apiece. That is to say, Columbus, the pious Catholic, compelled his officers and sailors to make affidavit to a lie, under the most horrible penalties. and so sent word home, when he was on the south side of the island of Cuba, that he had found Asia. Catholicity has all the credit of Columbus and his deeds, does it? If they had claimed less, they would have shown greater wisdom.

6. Furthermore, it is a well-known fact that Columbus was extremely cruel. His cruelty destroyed the lives of a third of the inhabitants of San Domingo in two years. The first vicar apostolic, an officer of the Roman Catholic Church, who was sent out to the West Indies in the interests of religion, could not endure Columbus's cruelty to the natives, and left and went home for that reason. Put it on record as he did.

It was Columbus who, in order to get gold, compelled the forced service of these poor people in the mines, a forced service, known in Spanish phrase as *repartimientos*, concerning which the best historians say it wrought the utmost degradation and ruin upon those unfortunate inhabitants. Even the poor natives reproved Columbus for his cruelty; and at length, to show the extraordinary dishonesty of the man who certainly had some great excellences, the Admiral defrauded the king and queen of Spain out of part of what he had promised them, giving as the flimsy excuse, that he did not tell them about the pearls which he had, because he wanted to wait until

he had more gold. This they did not seem to find an altogether satisfactory excuse, and the sons of Columbus were hooted in the street because of the dishonesty of their father.

7. To speak according to history, not according to the romantic ideas of Mr. Dougherty, when Mr. Justin Winsor, the librarian of Harvard College, sums up the life of Columbus in a very extraordinary paragraph, in a history of vast research and comprehensiveness, he says, "We have seen a pitiable man meet a pitiable death. Hardly a name in profane history is more august than his: hardly another character in the world's record has made so little of its opportunities. His discovery was a blunder: his blunder was a new world: the New World is his monument. Its discoverer might have been its father: he proved to be its despoiler. He might have given its young days such a benignity as the world likes to associate with a maker: he left it a legacy of devastation and crime. He might have been an unselfish promoter of geographical science: he proved a rabid seeker for gold and a vice-royalty. He might have won converts to the fold of Christ by the kindness of his spirit: he gained the execrations of the good angels. He might, like Las Casas, have rebuked the fiendishness of his contemporaries: he set them an example of perverted belief. The triumph of Barcelona led down to the ignominy of Valladolid, with every step in the degradation palpable and resultant." And yet of all this Mr. Dougherty, the Congress, and the Roman Catholic papers, affirm that "Catholicity" deserves the sole

credit. Let them have it, if they insist on so doing.

8. Catholicity has all the credit, furthermore, of Ferdinand and Isabella, and Ferdinand and Isabella founded and favored the Inquisition in Spain. It must have the credit of all that was done at that time, because there were no Protestants then, at least none to found an Inquisition. From 1481 to 1498, Torquemada, the chief inquisitor of Spain, burned eight thousand people at the stake, by the direct command of that great cardinal whom Mr. Dougherty praises, called "the third king" of Spain, the Cardinal Mendoza. If eight thousand were burned, how many perished in dungeons, how many died a wretched death, torn from their homes, despoiled of their fortunes, tortured and starved? All this he claims too, and we will admit the claim, if he still wishes to make it.

But does Rome deny the responsibility of the dishonorable and immoral deeds of Columbus? Does she deny the responsibility for the founding of the Inquisition? Does she deny the deeds of Torquemada in Spain? Then if she does deny it, and it will be to her credit if she does, notwithstanding the rash claims of her prelates and orators, if she does deny it, let her not claim that Rome has vastly superior rights to all others in this country because these pious Catholics discovered one of the West India Islands. (Applause.)

IV. Now for a Few Facts about the Discovery of America.

I do not propose to enter upon even a sketch of the life of Columbus. I have designed only to bring facts to bear upon the great claims which are made for him. It was an age of brave sailors, of awakening intellect, an age when art and science and true religion may have been said to have had their new birth. There were navigators before Columbus as daring as he: there were others, his contemporaries, no less so, among the Portuguese, the Genoese, the Welsh, the English, and the Spanish. Columbus sailed from Palos on the 3d of August, 1492, and discovered, on the 12th of October of the same year, it is believed, Cat Island, now called San Salvador. He never saw the continent of North America. So, if discovery gives the right of domination, what right grows out of his discovery so far as these United States are concerned? He did not discover the continent of America until after an Englishman, or rather a Florentine sailing under the English flag, had done it; for we know that Columbus discovered the continent of South America on the 2d of August, 1498, when John Cabot, sailing under the English flag, had discovered the continent of North America on the 24th of June, 1497. I have no desire whatever to detract from the real and just fame of Columbus; but as a matter of fact the great navigator never obtained any rights of discovery on the main land of North or South America, and if

Rome has any rights here, founded on anybody in the age of discovery, none of those rights can be founded upon Christopher Columbus.

Who did discover the continent of North America? Many very intelligent and able people in Boston combined to raise a monument to Lief Ericsson, who, they believe, discovered North America in the ninth century, about six hundred years before the time of Columbus. I do not know whether he did so or not, though I incline to believe that the weight of testimony favors the Norsemen. There are stories and traces out of which investigators construct such a probability. Moreover, a Welsh navigator, Madoc by name, took a colony to the west, and never came back, in the twelfth century. And as I have already stated, the Cabots, John Cabot the father, and Sebastian the son, discovered North America on the 24th of June, 1497, which was more than a year before Columbus found the mouth of the Orinoco in the northern part of South America.

I said at the beginning, that it seemed all important at a time like this that whatever strength there is in history should stand for the truth as against false claims. The false prophets get all their standing from being false historians. They invoke religion both for the past and the future. But religion cannot sanctify falsehood. Is there not something astounding in the fact that at a Congress representing the Roman Catholic Church her great preacher, Archbishop Ireland, should face the Protestants of this land and the world with the deliberate declaration that "As a religious system Protestantism is in

hopeless dissolution, utterly valueless as a doctrinal or moral power;" that her silver-tongued orator should assert as fact that "American Roman Catholics have silently submitted to wrongs and injustices and outrages in manifold shapes from time immemorial;" that again and again prelates and laymen should affirm that we owe about all our civilization to the Jesuit fathers. But it was thus that the twelve hundred members of this Congress recorded themselves. Do we not well to consider the words of our Lord?

Let me now say in closing: this country has been known to Europeans since the discovery by Columbus of the West India Islands in 1492. All that part that he had direct relations to, namely the West Indies and Brazil, and the northern part of South America, have had a history ever since, far different from that of the United States of North America. The Spaniard in America has not figured as a benefactor, whether we follow Cortez in Mexico, where he supplanted a false religion by a religion scarcely less cruel, or Pizarro in Peru, where much the same was true, — the religion of the Incas being better than the religion of Pizarro, less bloody, less cruel, less a curse to mankind, — while the Spaniards in Florida were as little benefactors as were those in the West Indies, in Mexico, and in South America.

In October, 1492, two days or so before Columbus saw land, the prow of his vessel being turned by the Gulf Stream current somewhat to the northward, he was bearing on in a direction that would have brought him to the Carolina coast. His brave and

experienced lieutenant, Pinzon, seeing a flock of parrots flying southward, begged Columbus, who was in great uncertainty, to turn his vessel's course to the south-west. Columbus yielded to his protestations, and bore away to the southward. Thus, in the order of an infinitely wise Providence, the Spaniard landed on the scattered islands of the West Indies, rather than on the virgin coast of the Carolinas. Thus the inscrutable wisdom of Almighty God saved from Spanish devastation the land in which we live, saved it from the domination of an idolatrous and cruel religion. Thus infinite wisdom, that on little pivots swings the doors of great centuries, mercifully diverted the Spanish fleet from the shores of our country, and left this virgin continent to be found, upbuilt, and glorified by English Protestantism. (Applause.)

SPANISH ROMANISM AND ENGLISH PROTESTANTISM

ON THE WESTERN CONTINENT.

I AM to speak to you this afternoon on Spanish Romanism and English Protestantism on the Western Continent. As from a hill-top one surveys through a glass the vast and varied landscape, so from the heights of history, through the glass of divine truth, I desire with you to survey one of the vastest of all the eras of national and religious life which has ever transpired upon this planet. That portion of the Holy Scriptures through which we shall look, consists of two representative statements, the one made by the statesman-prophet Daniel, the other by the unequalled apostle to the Gentiles. In the 4th chapter of Daniel's prophecy and the 17th verse, addressing Nebuchadnezzar, he says, "To the intent that the living may know that the Most High ruleth in the kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever he will, and setteth up over it the basest of men." The passage from the apostle to the Gentiles is where, in the Acts of the Apostles, xvii. 26, addressing the Athenians, he says, "God hath made of one blood all nations to dwell on the face of the earth, and hath determined the times

before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation."

1. The doctrine taught by the prophet Daniel is that whatever the eddies or the currents of human history, God is supreme over all, and that sometimes, in the order of his providence, he permits nations to set up over them the basest of rulers, in order that by their experience with bad rulers and bad laws they may learn thus not to try the experiment again, and that unrighteousness is not for the advantage of any people; as he permitted the Israelites to set up Saul as king, for which they had occasion always to be sorry: so, says Daniel, the supreme ruler of men and nations, who taketh up the isles as a very little thing, and counts "the nations as the small dust of the balance," raises up to supreme places, at times, me nof ignoble character, that He may teach through them, to all coming generations, how futile it is to attempt by unrighteousness to prosper either nations or men. While St. Paul, in harmony with what I said to you on last Sunday, surveying the providential placing of men in all portions of the earth, says, if I may paraphrase, These people are not here by chance: they have not been placed in their various geographical locations by accident; but that God who made the unity of men perfect in their original creation, has prescribed a diversity of zones and lands and shores where they may work out the experiment of civilization to the boundaries of their habitations, in order that by drawing lines along these boundaries, men, in studying nations, may see how infinitely superior some are to others, and may

then inquire the reason for such inequality, for the better regulation of their constitutions, their politics, and their conduct.

2. The vast movements of God's providence are as well worth studying as the small. A man who calls himself a Christian, with grave and solemn visage reproving me, said on last Monday, "Why didn't you preach Christ on Sunday?" I said, "Were you there on Sunday night? Then my discourse was all concerning Christ." He said, "No; but I didn't think you preached Christ on Sunday afternoon." I suppose all the use that man has for Christ is to have Him wait on him (laughter), but my thought of Christ is that he is the King of nations, the Son of God clothed with power, and that I preach Christ when I point to his footsteps in history, as much as when I point to his footsteps in your house or in your heart. On a nation, which God regards as a very little thing, he looks with the same grace or the same wrath as on a man; and taking a whole continent for the arena, taking nations and races as the characters, taking centuries as the time, and colossal national results as the consequences, I desire to-day, in your presence, to review the workings of the two great systems of religion that are disputing for precedence in this country, that you may clearly and judicially decide which of them should control and have the right of way.

3. The arena is a continent, the Western Continent. Did you ever think that on this Western Continent, like a jewelled girdle crossing its broad front, the United States of America is really the only

prosperous nation among all its political divisions? that all but English Canada are Roman Catholic, save only the United States of America; and that, without exception, apart from the United States of America, all these nations are abject and degraded? Mexico, the states of Central America, Brazil, the United States of Colombia, Peru, Chili, Argentina, Uruguay, — there you have all the rest of the continent, save that which lies to the north of us, which is half Protestant, half Papist; while in the face of angels and men is thrust through the geographical centre of North America a free Protestant republic, to show the world the *contrast between Romanism and Protestantism.* (Applause.)

I. The conditions under which this vast test of religions was tried are of the most thrilling character. The period following 1492, when Columbus discovered San Salvador, was the period of colonization in this country: abroad it was a period of astonishing revolution and agitation.

1. From 1492, one hundred and fifty years being counted, you have movements in Europe of the greatest magnitude. Shakspeare and Tasso among the poets; Henry the Eighth, Charles the Fifth, Philip the Second, and Elizabeth among the rulers; Luther, Calvin, and Zwinglius among the reformers, are a few of its personages. The Spanish people, at the time of the discovery of America, and for quite a time later, were the leading people of Europe; a powerful, proud, bold race, not inferior in any respect, so far as I know, to any race on the continent. The Jews had brought their enterprise, and the

Moors their culture to Spain; and though they were driven out with fire and sword, and were fiercely tortured by the Inquisition, the Spanish Empire was mighty, almost dominant.

2. Romanism, in the early part of the sixteenth century, and in the last part of the fifteenth, was practically in full control of Europe. She had everything her own way: its monarchs were her servants; her will was the law of states; the popes were the arbiters of nations. St. Peter's church was just begun. The Pope wanted money for it, and all Europe was taxed to furnish the same. The sellers of indulgences had gone into the Germanic and all other states in Europe, and the sale of indulgences was as much a business as the sale of wheat or cloth. One-third of the revenues of Germany was poured over the Alps into the lap of the Pope, and riches and splendor abounded in the palaces of the bishops and prelates, while poverty prevailed among the ranks of the people.

3. Luther was born nine years before the discovery of America by Columbus. About the time when Cortez made the conquest of Mexico, Luther made the conquest of Germany, and the Reformation was in full swing. The massacre of St. Bartholomew occurred in 1572, scarce half a century before the pilgrims landed at Plymouth. The Dutch Republic rose and resisted the power of Philip II. and the Duke of Alva; won its liberty under the masterly direction of William the Silent, who in turn fell before the bullet of a Jesuit assassin. The Swiss Reformation convulsed that little republic, and laid

the foundations of those Protestant states which from that time until this have been incomparably superior to all the other states of the Swiss confederation. Ignatius Loyola was born, the Jesuits were incorporated, and the counter reformation, deformation I might say, was begun. The Inquisition flourished in Spain, as it had flourished in the Middle Ages in France and in Germany.

4. Such is the merest suggestion of the vast events of which Europe was the theatre at the time when the Western Continent was discovered and colonized. This western world was unknown: its gates were just opening. At the mouth of its vast rivers the navigators saw such floods as to infer that they came from great distances and drained wide areas. The populations of the western world were scarcely imagined, and were uncounted. Here were civilizations in the north and in the south. The city of Mexico at that time was great and populous, having as is supposed sixty thousand householders. The Incas in Peru had already built cyclopean structures as great as any that the world has ever seen. There was civilization on this continent. The Five Nations in the Mohawk Valley of the State of New York had a barbarous form of life, but a national unity and administration far removed above savagery.

Here, then, is the arena for the great experiment. On this continent these European nations were to have an opportunity of testing their forms of faith and civilization. What a spectacle is this to look upon! Romanism, having the start, is to have a

chance in North and South America over these wonderful lands, and with these pliable peoples, to show what she will make of them. And Bible Protestantism also is to have its opportunity at the same time. Spain stands, in the title of my discourse, for other nations as well, which were strictly Romanist: for Portugal, which was foremost in discovery and colonization, for France also, which was scarcely behind; while English Protestantism stands as well for the Protestantism of the Dutch, who were associated with the English, and the Swedes to the northward, who also had an important part in the colonization of this country.

The experiment was made. Spain, France, Portugal, brought hither their institutions and colonized despotism, their cruel and their formal semi-pagan faith. The English, with the Dutch to help them, and the Swedes co-operating, colonized here; establishing constitutional liberty, biblical knowledge, pure morality, and freedom for man.

II. I desire you to look with me for a moment at the conquest of this country, and the beginnings of this colonization.

1. You cannot find, with the Spanish on the one hand, and the English on the other, any such differences of race or nationality or climate as shall account for the different results of their labors on this continent. The only possible way to account for the difference in what they brought to pass, is by the religious faith which dominated them. Spain, discovering the country first, had the first opportunity for colonization.

2. Let us look at the work of the Spanish Romanist in America.

1. You know what Columbus did in the West Indies: you know that he became the ravisher and despoiler of the country, as I told you on last Sabbath. He had hardly won the admiralty for which he struggled so long, before the daring Cortez, a Spaniard, was not only ready to follow but go beyond him in the conquest of the New World. With a company of followers as hardy as their chief, he invaded Mexico, and having scuttled his ships at Vera Cruz, advanced toward the capital of that remarkable empire. In the year 1521, after a series of desperate encounters, the Montezumas yielded their throne to the Spaniards, and Cortez was master of the land. The Spanish found a people who dwelt in great houses and large communities, who had a bloody religion, as cruel as that of the Spaniards themselves, and they supplanted the decapitation of the Aztec on the great pyramid, with the burning of the Aztec in the public square.

Ten years later Pizarro, who was as brave as Cortez, had gone south to the domain of the Incas, and 1530 or 1533 finds him practically master of the very centre of South America. There, in the midst of walls and houses and temples which have been the wonder of subsequent times, Pizarro arrested the lawful ruler of the country, promised him his liberty if he should furnish a large amount of gold, and at length, after receiving sixteen millions of money as the price of his ransom, treacherously betrayed him to death.

2. The southern peoples to whom the Spaniards went were far superior to those of the north. Whoever reads the history of the Aztec and the Inca civilization, knows full well that these people were somewhat civilized at least, and might, undoubtedly, from the gentleness of th ir manners and their singular susceptibility to the influence of the white man, have become far superior to the North American Indian, under anything like a wise and kind policy. Such were the beginnings of Spanish conquest and colonization.

3. The English came a century and a half later. Their first settlement was at Jamestown in 1607. A rather weak colony was this. They seemed to have but little idea of what they came for, except to find release from the burdens of the old world, and it was not long before they were divided by internal dissensions, and so decimated with various hardships that they hardly represented the spirit of English colonization. But 1620 saw another sight. On the rocky shores of Cape Cod, landed the men who brought the Holy Scriptures, the constitutional compact, and the purpose to have truth and righteousness prevail wherever they had control. New York developed very shortly after, or may have been said to precede the Plymouth colony, in that the Dutch made their explorations about the year 1610, bringing from the fields of Holland the traditions of liberty which they had shared with the Pilgrims in Leyden, and the purpose to resist tyranny which had animated their great leader, William of Orange. The Quaker Penn, shortly after this, came to Penn-

sylvania and laid the foundations, in a peaceful purchase and a serene Christian faith, of the most pacific colony that was ever planted on North American shores. The Swedes, fresh from the wars in which they had been led by Gustavus Adolphus and his grandson Gustavus Vasa, both champions of Protestantism, had undertaken, also, to begin in Delaware and New Jersey a new state on the principles which they had inherited from Protestant traditions and struggles. Here on the one hand you see the Protestant in the hard and unfriendly north, on the other, the Spaniard in the genial and fruitful south, with their opportunities to work out the experiment for which they had come. Evidently the Spanish had the best chance: they had the earliest start, the finest country, were richest in minerals, and had the most civilized native populations.

III. What principles did these two bring to the planting of America, principles of which we are now reaping the results? The fundamental ideas of the Spaniard and of the Englishman were the fundamental ideas of Romanism and Protestantism.

1. The Spaniard, catching the spirit of the popes, desired more than everything else, gold. Everywhere this was his cry. For this he enslaved the natives and sold them in European markets; for this he forced them into the mines where they perished miserably; for this he decimated the native populations everywhere with fire and sword. Gold and silver were everywhere the Spaniard's cry.

2. Then wherever he went he founded the Inquisition: that had been his engine of bigotry at home,

and he set it up here in this land. There is not a capital in South America which is as old as Spanish colonization and rule, but what has Inquisition buildings; while in the city of Mexico it is scarcely thirty years since these chambers of horrors were seized by the government and appropriated to the purposes of education. Three centuries that Inquisition prevailed, wherever the Spanish Romanist had dominion. By it he here burned men as they had burned them in Seville and Madrid. Forty-eight were burned at one time in the plaza of Mexico. One hundred were burned and thousands scourged for their faith in the Lima Inquisition by the Spanish Romanists.
Romanists.

3. They built costly churches, as Romanism builds everywhere. The people in hovels, the priests in palaces! The cathedral in Lima cost nine millions of dollars; that in the capital of Honduras cost five millions of dollars. In the old Spanish American towns to-day, with their hovels all around them, are supported the most matchless church structures for splendor and for costliness to be found on this continent. A single chandelier in a little Mexican church cost sixty thousand dollars, and the people who bought it, whose money bought it, earn twenty-five cents or less a day. The cathedral in Mexico was ninety years in building. Indulgences were everywhere sold. Masses were everywhere said. Priests were continually giving absolution. Confessions were being taken without ceasing. These were the fundamental ideas of the Spaniard, to which all but the lust of gold was subservient.

4. What were the fundamental ideas of the Protestant English? Religion had its controlling place with them all and always, but it was a very different type of religion from that of the Spaniards.

The religion of the English Protestant made him free. There are no Inquisition buildings in the United States. None were ever built by Dutchman or Swede or Englishman. Their religion did not embrace the idea of suppressing free opinion. The small amount of persecution on which so many of our liberal friends ring a hundred changes here in this State, when they scarcely raise their voice against the awful curse of Roman Catholic persecutions, — the little persecution in this State was as a drop to an ocean, compared with that which the Spanish Romanist everywhere forced upon the natives. I suggest that the people who have so much to say against the Puritans for their narrowness, folly, and bigotry in the small amount of persecution of which they were guilty in this country, should turn their attention to the real persecutors of the world, who have cursed by religious hate and torture every land on the face of the earth. (Applause.) Everywhere the English Protestant opened the free school. He built a church, but it was plain and comparatively poor. So humble were these structures that there is scarcely a Protestant church in this country which has survived the period of colonization. The people built homes, and then they built meeting-houses and schools. Everywhere there were schools for the common people. Rome founded choice schools for the aristocrats: she trained some of the people to a very

high point of culture, but the large majority of the common people were left in intellectual darkness.

The English Protestant, instead of transporting the spirit of despotism to these shores, brought with him the idea of government by the people, and that such rule could only be properly exercised in connection with the diffusion of general intelligence. It is true that the curse of slavery was tolerated by these Protestant Englishmen, sad to say. But if you balance the slavery of the Romanist Spaniards over against the slavery of Protestant Englishmen, and so leave slavery out of the account, bad as it is, there remains an awful balance against the Roman Catholic religion and the Roman Catholic Spaniard in the lands of Central and South America. (Applause.)

IV. Thus were the seeds planted. These were the ideas laid down, these were the institutions begun, three centuries ago in this country, some of them longer ago than that. Down under the forms of national and social life these religious ideas began to take root. They have grown with the centuries, and what do they present us as their consequences to-day?

1. The Spanish colonies up to this very hour are the theatre of constant bloody revolution. Wherefore? Because the people are trying, as they have been trying for three hundred years, to throw off the tyranny which was imposed upon them by the Spaniard. Everywhere, even this very month, the South American and Central American Republics are trembling under the convulsions of those struggles for

liberty which man can never forego, however abject his condition. In Mexico, that magnificent country, sixteen times as large as the State of New York, in the short space of sixty-two years there were fifty-two presidents, one emperor, and one regency, every one of which terminated with violence, with disorder, and with revolution. They know nothing of a stable government. Moreover, just as soon as liberty gets a foothold, its strenuous and most intense enemy in all those countries is the Roman Catholic hierarchy. They foster and favor revolution and intrigue to create war, expecting to profit in the general confusion. To-day the greatest antagonist of the republican government of Mexico is the archbishop of Mexico and his priests. We know that Rome fosters revolution. Tell me why the Pope of Rome alone, of all the rulers in this world, gave his hand to Jefferson Davis when the latter was trying to break up this free republic? He was simply following out their policy everywhere and always. In this presidential year, perhaps because they like to print it, the papers are telling us that the Pope is growing liberal; and a prominent archbishop now in Rome, who wants very much, it is said, to be cardinal, tells us what a large public spirit now controls the vatican; but a thousand years of history tell us to beware of the tiger's paw, however soft (applause), until we know that his claws have been cut off. (Great applause.)

2. These people, the fruit of Spanish American colonization, are everywhere illiterate. There are not only very few free schools, but those which have

been established have been planted in defiance of the continual opposition of the priests. For instance, Chili, with which we had a little unpleasantness not long ago, and which is, except Argentina, perhaps the most prosperous nation in South America, Chili shows us one child in school out of twenty-five of her population. One person in seven only can read; only one person in eight can write. And Chili is, as I say, almost the brightest product of Spanish American civilization to the south of these United States.

3. The immorality of the peoples in Spanish Roman Catholic countries is universally known. In Chili the legitimate births out of ninety thousand are only sixty-eight thousand, while between twenty-one and twenty-two thousand are illegitimate. In Ecuador seventy-five per cent of the children are born out of wedlock; and Ecuador is the most thoroughly under the control of the priests of any country in South America. What is the reason for this immorality? We are told that there are very few marriages there, for the reason that the charge made by the priests is so great that the people in their poverty cannot afford to have the ceremony performed; and yet, wherever the governments have undertaken to introduce civil marriage so that by law poor people could be married and their children be born in wedlock, the governments have, in every case, been cursed and excommunicated by the representatives of the Roman Catholic Church. In Mexico M. Biart states that "the priests are forcing the poor to live in concubinage by exacting from them

for the marriage ceremony a sum which the Mexican laborer could not earn in five years, and very recent authorities say that the peon who is married by a priest becomes practically a part of the estate for life of the landlord who lends him the needed sum for marriage by the church. The marriage fees demanded by the priests in Chili were twenty-five dollars until the government took a hand in it and reduced them to twenty-five cents (laughter), and now the priests refuse to marry the people unless at a price which they cannot afford to pay. So the governments marry them, and the priests curse them.

4. Passing from this sad picture of immorality, I look at the poverty of the people. Recollect that in our survey we are sweeping a great territory and looking upon many nations, from the Rio Grande to Cape Horn, and from the Pacific to the Atlantic. You will observe that the people everywhere are lamentably poor. In Mexico, desiring to develop the country, the government some time ago offered fifty dollars for every immigrant that would come, and promised, in addition, that they would support the immigrants until they secured work (while the United States is almost prepared to offer fifty dollars to every one that will stay away, for a while at least). (Applause.) I ask you why it is that Mexico bids in vain for immigration, while we are perplexed to know what we shall do with the multitudes who come here? Why do not the European Romanists, if they love the pope and the control of the Roman Catholic hierarchy, why do not they go to Mexico, to Central America, to Brazil, and to all

these countries that want them so much? Ah, in their hearts they do not love the Pope: in their hearts they love liberty, they love progress, they love prosperity. (Sensation.) And that is why, thank God, a great many of them are here this afternoon, because they believe in manhood and in God (applause) more than they believe in the priest or the Pope; because they want what the Bible and Protestantism have made here, and what Romanism has never afforded in any nation of the world. And when I see them coming to this country, I stand as their friend and say, Come; but do not come to make us like those lands of the south, over which the papacy has had such complete control.

Fifty years ago the Church of Rome in Mexico owned, through charitable grants, three-fifths of the wealth of the city. The income of the Bishop was greater than that of the Queen of England. One-tenth of the product of the country went to the clergy. In 1850 the value of church property was estimated at $300,000,000, one-third the value of the nation. The annual income of the church of the city of Mexico was $20,000,000, while that of the republic was only $18,000,000. This immense wealth, it must be remembered, was wrung from the slender purses of the poor.

Take the little state of Guanajuato in Mexico, out of whose mines eight hundred millions of dollars in silver have been taken, and the people there are working for forty cents a day. In Ecuador, a man is glad to get six cents a day working as a potter, twelve cents a day working as a hat-maker, and

twenty-five cents a day working as a silk manufacturer. Romanism always impoverishes the laborer. The wages in all these countries show how hard it is for a man to live; and yet a very large proportion of what they earn goes into the hands of the priests, even now, while their poverty grows upon them apace.

5. Moreover, the papacy is so manifestly unfriendly to the prosperity of the people, that in all these South American states when there is a revolution, when they do rise in favor of free government, the people invariably strike first at the church, as their worst enemy. A priest cannot openly wear his cassock in Mexico. Parochial schools are forbidden in Mexico now, while they are fostered in the United States. Guatemala abolished both monasteries and convents: we help support them. San Salvador elects its own priests: popes and bishops appoint them in Massachusetts. Costa Rica and Argentina expel all priests that interfere in common-school education: we put them at the head of our tables at banquets, on our library committees, and often on our school-boards. (Sensation and applause.) Brazil, poor old Brazil, abolished the monasteries in 1870, and well she might, for it is not yet a year since I read in one of the daily papers of this city, a letter from a gentleman who had been travelling in that country, who said Brazil showed us in the Roman Catholic Church the most utterly corrupt institution on the face of the earth. That was current news in one of the papers that we read every morning. So you note, and cannot fail to be impressed with the fact, that

everywhere when freemen rise they know their tyrants and repudiate them; and the tyrant which they first strike, from the Rio Grande to Cape Horn, is the Roman Catholic Church.

6. Turn now to see what is the fruit of English Protestantism on this Western Continent. I do not ask you to be prejudiced in favor of the United States. Everybody I suppose loves his own country best, and is somewhat blind to its faults. But, ladies and gentlemen, no man is so blind but that he can see that for all the purposes of humanity and civilization, the United States of America to-day is worth all the rest of the Western Continent. (Great applause.) What of the stability of our government here, compared with the upheavals there? For a hundred years and more this government has stood, growing to-day in the affections of the people faster than ever before. One mighty Civil War only; and twenty-five years after, as the other day in a Southern State, when a friend of mine presented a company, many of whom had been Confederate soldiers, with the old stars and stripes, men who had but one arm, and lost the other fighting against the flag in '61, raised the remaining arm to swing their hats for a banner which presents to them a better nationality than we ever had before. (Great applause.) To-day, if a foreign squadron should land on our Southern coast, it would not need a man from the north to drive it off and send it home again. The men of the late confederacy are the men of the nation to-day, and the stability of our government was never so sure as it is this blessed hour. (Great applause.)

What of the schools of learning among the people, what of the average intelligence, what of the average morality of the United States of North America? When such men as De Tocqueville and Bryce come here to study our institutions and our people, men who take the broadest possible sweep in their survey of the nation, they unhesitatingly pronounce the people of this country the happiest, the best governed, the most truly and intelligently religious, and the most moral on the face of the earth; and in so saying, they have the statistics of the archives of all governments to support them. The wealth and progress of the country exhilarates us at every turn. We protest, and well we may, against the poverty of the poor that is brought about in any case by the avarice of the rich; but the vile "sweat-shops" of New York and Boston, against whose low wages we are so indignant, furnish about four times the wages that are paid to the laborer in the Spanish Romanist countries, south of the Rio Grande. The people in this country who are the worst off are better off than the common people of those countries. They have no middle class there. They have a few aristocrats and a horde of peons. Here, about all in the country that is good for anything is the middle class. (Applause.) A little would-be aristocracy, certainly not the cream of the nation, and a class from European Romanist countries, whom I don't know as we can ever lift up; but, God helping us, we will try, until the last and lowest man in America is a man. (Applause.) I know we have a hard task. I know there are people dumped in here from Europe who

are very vile, but in the face of this Christian audience, I say, though we may be slow in doing it, we will try until the Pole and the Bohemian and the Austrian and the Hungarian and the Italian, all degraded by ecclesiastical tyranny are all lifted up and ennobled. God help us, it is worth working for! (Great applause.)

V. A few words to draw the suitable inference from this survey, and I have done. We have looked upon the policy and principles, the seed-sowing and the harvest of Romanism and Protestantism on this Western Continent. Romanism tried its experiment with supreme external advantages for success. The mightiest nations of Europe at the time behind it, the grandest areas in the world before it, and people to civilize if they would civilize them; to Christianize if they would Christianize them. The supreme experiment of Rome on the Western Continent has ended in supreme failure. (Applause.) Its supreme opportunity has terminated in supreme overthrow. The papacy can never point with pride to its three hundred years of influence on Mexico, Central America and the South American states.

Protestantism also had its opportunity. That opportunity has not been fully met. Protestantism is not as pure as I would God it were, nor has it done all that we know it might have done; but this may with truth be said, that the supreme opportunity of Protestantism on this Western Continent has issued, up to date, in the supremest national success that was ever known in the history of the world. (Great applause.) We might have done better: we ought

to have done better; but when we marshal the nations from the Yellow Sea to the Atlantic shore, and between the two poles; when we order them and draw them up in line, the easy headship of all the nations is in this republic. (Applause.)

And now what are we asked to do? We are asked to forget the lessons of history, to forget the experiment of Romanism on this continent, and to give her the command of this republic. After she has done what she has done in Mexico, in Central America and South America, we are asked to let her do it here. To forget history, to forget God, to forget experience, and to let the Pope rule in these United States. What is our duty when such a demand is made? It is our duty to read the lesson of the past, to survey the face of the present, and to prophesy the future, and to hold fast what our fathers gave us, for God and for the race. If we sink in the general ruin, who will rise in this continent of the west to give hope to liberty and the world? Now is the hour, now is the time and the place for us to repudiate the claims of a system of religion that has darkened and blighted so large a portion of the western world. (Great applause.)

This Easter Sabbath morning, at a quarter-past ten o'clock, I heard the fire-alarm sounding. My little boy came rushing up to the study, and said, "Papa, the fire is right here on Prescott Street." From my window I looked out. A great building was sending forth from its roof vast clouds of smoke and columns of fire. I looked upon it for an anxious moment, then bethought me of the brave men in this

city who are always ready to meet emergencies like this. They had heard the alarm before me. And ere I thought of them, they were at the place of danger. It was but a few moments before I saw a stream flashing like silver, arching here and there through the smoke from the top of a neighboring building, — a jet of water from the steam fire-engine. Then up went a ladder on this side, up went one on that, and through the smoke, and almost into the fire, climbed firemen higher and higher. They were on the roof; they had dragged up after them their hose, and advanced to, apparently into, the fire. Shrouded in smoke, as the wind changed, they worked. I thought they would suffocate. A hole was cut in the roof; then, so great was the outburst of the ingulfing smoke and fire, that I thought they must have perished, and that the roof had fallen in; but as the wind blew the smoke aside, ten minutes after, there they were, pygmies in size, giants in daring, their coats shining wet, and the streams of water pouring at short range into the fiery gulf below and around them. As I gazed, my throat was choked, my eyes ran over with tears. And I thought, "Will these brave men dare all that to save a little property? Will they do that for their credit as firemen, just to save that factory?"

And then I thought again of my country. I thought of the dark clouds of smoke which burst out here and there, revealing to us dangerous fires which smoulder and blaze within. I thought how here and there an alarm-bell rings, and a few who love their country hasten to the rescue. And I said to myself,

Well may men advance into the very fire of persecution; well may they be shrouded in the smoke of malicious epithet and slander; well may they be lost to human praise or vision — ay, may even sink into the fiery gulf below, which Jesuitic hate prepares, rather than let this republic perish (applause); and there alone, with my eyes on heroes in action, my thoughts on time and eternity, while the preachers were telling in their Easter sermons of the risen Christ, my convictions had a new birth, and I vowed again to God that, with truth to pour on these papal pretensions, I would climb to the place of peril, and face the fire, that I might help to save my country or, if needs be, perish in the struggle. (Loud and long-continued applause.)

DESPOTISM IN CHURCH AND STATE THE PRINCIPLE OF ROMANISM.

THE words of our Lord in the Gospel according to St. Mark, the tenth chapter, beginning at the thirty-fifth verse: —

"And James and John, the sons of Zebedee, come unto him, saying, Master, we would that thou shouldest do for us whatsoever we shall desire.

"And he said unto them, What would ye that I should do for you?

"They said unto him, Grant unto us that we may sit, one on thy right hand, and the other on thy left hand, in thy glory.

"But Jesus said unto them, Ye know not what ye ask: can ye drink of the cup that I drink of? and be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with?

"And they said unto him, We can. And Jesus said unto them, Ye shall indeed drink of the cup that I drink of; and with the baptism that I am baptized withal shall ye be baptized:

"But to sit on my right hand and on my left hand is not mine to give; but it shall be given to them for whom it is prepared.

"And when the ten heard it, they began to be much displeased with James and John.

"But Jesus called them to him, and saith unto them, Ye know that they which are accounted to rule over the Gentiles exercise lordship over them; and their great ones exercise authority upon them.

"But so shall it not be among you: but whosoever will be great among you, shall be your minister:

"And whosoever of you will be the chiefest, shall be servant of all. For even the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many."

1. This is my text. On last Sabbath, reviewing a period of history measured by centuries, surveying the entire western hemisphere, North, Central, and South America, observing the nations that had been founded respectively by the Romanist Spaniard, and by the Protestant Englishman, we were forced to the conclusion that the work of the latter in the period of colonization and development had given us by far the better type of nationality. And when we farther inquired, history presented us the picture of a score of down-trodden and degraded nations on this continent, and only one single nation and part of Canada showing the highest characteristics of national life. We saw that from Mexico to Cape Horn, all the Romanist peoples whose governments the Spaniard created were characterized by lack of progress, by poverty, by illiteracy, by immorality, and by incessant change and revolution in their civil state. And we found that in these respects the United States of America, which are certainly the

fruit of English, Dutch, and Swedish Protestantism, displayed the highest degree of literacy, morality, piety, wealth, progress, and stability, of any nation on the Western Continent, and, perhaps, of any nation in the world.

2. Having taken this survey, and come to this conclusion, it was a gratification to me, only a day or two since, to find that our conclusions were indorsed by a famous Roman Catholic authority, — a writer known by the assumed name of Pomponio Leto, who was, if not a member of the Vatican Council, thoroughly informed of all its proceedings, and who wrote the letters which constitute the book which I hold in my hand, during the Vatican Council in 1870. In February of that year he wrote as follows concerning the work of Romanism through the Spanish, in America. He is pleading for attention on the part of the Vatican Council to the great matters and concerns of national life, and he says, —

"What part did the Catholicism of Torquemada" (you will remember him as the chief inquisitor of Spain) "and of Philip II. take in the grand discovery and colonization of those new countries which are the glory of the last two centuries? Who has profited by the work of Christopher Columbus and of Amerigo Vespucci? What has Catholicism, following, though more quietly, in the same track of discovery, effected in North America, — a country entirely free, in which all religions emulate one another? And, again, in Australia? These two parts of the world came into being, as it were, in a moment, through the diffusion and expansion of the European,

and, therefore, Christian race; and what part in the miracle can be attributed to Catholicism? Has not the Catholic Church, on the contrary, reason for sad meditation on the spectacle presented by Mexico, and the other unhappy republics of the South, which are entirely under her sway? Here one would think are plenty of subjects well-deserving the whole attention of the Catholic hierarchy assembled in Rome; for such facts may be more or less appreciated, may be understood in one sense or another, and attributed to this or that cause; but their existence cannot be denied, and, therefore, they ought to be considered."

He makes further statements, still stronger, of the same import, and closes his letter with these words: "It is a true picture of the state of things prevailing at the present day in all communities governed by the Ultra-Catholic *régime*, though, of course, varying in different countries according to their respective conditions. We find in them many churches, but few schools; more devotion than virtue; more passion than judgment; general intolerance, and scanty prosperity, with fluctuations of submission and rebellion. They are characterized everywhere by a craving for authority, — whether in a convent or a sect, — but without any appreciation of the real nature of authority, which is alternately adored with servility and subjected to outrage."

In truth none can differ from these conclusions, save they who dispute history. But now as we turn from the picture of facts to the principles underlying those facts, there remains to us a new course of observation and reasoning.

3. Two ideas prevail in government, the first selfish and despotic, the second generous and free. The first was illustrated in the disposition and request of those disciples of our Lord who aspired to prominence without regard to fitness, and who desired to control without reference to service. Our Lord says to them, This is the general way of the world, but this is not my way. No man can have place in God's kingdom unless he is fit for it, and his fitness for it lies in his power of service. Therefore, if any man among you will be great, let him be the servant of the rest; and the man that serves most shall be the prince in the kingdom of God. In other words, in the passage which I read in the Gospel according to St. Mark, Christ condemns wholly the method of despotic and tyrannical government, and places over against it the idea which only finds its realization in a free republic of equal men co-operating with one another for the common good. It is these two principles that I desire this afternoon with you to review. The principle of a selfish despotism, an absolute monarchy, contrasted with the free constitutional republic, which is its contradictory; and I trust it can be done in such a way that you will be interested and profited.

4. You know that there are countries on the face of the earth, and have been for many centuries, the rule of which is totally different from that of our own. These countries we call despotisms, or absolute monarchies, and they present the antipodes of that kind of government under which we have experienced our advantages and found our progress. Russia and

Turkey and Persia, and African tribes and nations to-day are the remnants of such despotisms, which once prevailed over most of the world; while you find such nations as Germany and Italy gradually emerging with a constitutional monarchy which is largely despotic; England with an aristocracy left, which is a trace of that form of absolutism; and our own country, with Switzerland and some other republics of the world, endeavoring to work out in free mutual service that idea of government concerning which our Lord spoke in commendation. I wish, therefore, now to contrast these two general ideas of government, and my object in so doing will be very clear before I have done.

I. What is a despotism, and what are its principles and effects? For if I show you that it is the purpose and effort of a large body of thoroughly trained and disciplined men to revolutionize our form of government in this republic, and to give us instead a thoroughly contradictory form, I really think that you will take a profound interest in the conclusion. What are the principles which underlie a government like Russia or Persia or Turkey?

1. The first of all the things assumed is that the ruler is chosen by Heaven, not by the people: God has given him a divine right to control men. His rights are first and regal: theirs are secondary and servile. The people have, under a despotic form of government, what the ruler grants, and no more. He can take all they have without asking the privilege from any. He commands them, their persons and their property. The des-

potic ruler says, "Our kingdom, our people, our state, our rights;" as Louis XIV. said, "I am the state." The despot, and those creatures who are near him, make the laws. These laws the people must obey. Under a despotism the people exist for the ruler, not the ruler for the people. The ruler's money is not the people's money, but the people's money is the ruler's money. The ruler's person is not the property of the people, but the people's persons are the property of the ruler. Everything centres in him and around him. Life, liberty, and happiness are at the ruler's mercy.

2. These are the principles. What do they show when they are wrought out? What are some of the effects of despotic government in the history of the world? Mark well these effects. First of all you have a royal house embracing all that I have just described. Then you have an aristocracy very rich and powerful, consisting of the few only who are nearest the king. You have in this aristocracy a vast amount of immorality. No aristocracy ever existed on this earth under a despotism but was vile, because they do not recognize the people below them as men; and the peoples who have enslaved another, have violated almost all the commandments of the Decalogue, just because they take this view of the people whom they enslave, that they are not entitled to human rights. The aristocrat who debauches the peasant and his family, or takes his property, or destroys his life, does not consider that he has violated the rights of the oppressed party. So you have an immoral aristocracy under a despotism. People

are very far separated through these castes, as I have already intimated. The aristocracy live on the people, and out of the people's work, and while they toil not, neither do they spin, yet they have the wealth, the power, and the pleasure.

The people under a despotism may be oppressed in every way. In their private affairs they are subjected to constant police espionage. Every government that tends to a despotic form may interfere with the business of every man, and no man's house is his castle except under a constitutional government. The people are all heavily taxed. The little which they earn is divided with the government, which gets an undue share, and their burdens are enormous. They are uneducated, and always illiterate. Why? Because they could not be the creatures of a tyrant if they were educated. Therefore, no despotism ever educates the common people, and never will. For the education of the people makes such a form of government impossible. The people are greatly restricted in their communications and movements. They cannot go where they will. There are thousands of Russians who would gladly have fled from Russia within the last five years, only that they were forbidden to go out of the communities in which they lived, and all the power of the army and the police of the empire prevented them from removing from that village or that region. Under a despotism, if there be a press, that press is muzzled. Only three or four days ago we had it stated that in Russia a decree had been issued to the effect that: Any person giving knowledge of the army, or facts concerning it,

to anybody outside of Russia, would be liable to serve seven years in solitary confinement in a fortress, and then be sent for the remainder of his life to the mines of Siberia. And George Kennan tells us in his valuable papers and illustrations in the *Century* magazine that it is a common thing for a censor of the press in Russia to blot out column after column, and page after page, from the newspapers, simply because the caprice of the government insists upon suppressing facts and truth.

All tyrannies have great armies. How, do you say, are those armies recruited? From the people, though sometimes from a foreign people. How is it possible to recruit the people thus to become their own tyrants? For the reason, that to be a soldier is not only to live easier than a peasant, but it is to give a chance for the exercise of the natural savagery of the human heart. You find, therefore, these great armies in all despotisms holding down the people, debauching their morals, and trampling on their rights.

The courts are a mockery of justice, servilely registering the will of the ruler. The prison systems are all of the cruelest sort. Scenic displays are used on a vast scale to keep the people quiet so that they shall not think. There is no Sabbath which is used as a holy day under any despotic form of government. Religion is made an engine of the state, and, as I have already intimated, in the person of the ruler is concentrated all the power and control over religion as well as politics.

Now this is but a feeble portrayal of the actual

facts under a despotic government, and yet the little finger of such a tyranny you and I would resent with our hearts' best blood. (Applause.) It is simply intolerable to men who have, as have we, a free ancestry and a free country.

II. On the other hand, let me call your attention to the peculiarities of a free constitutional government as contrasted with a despotism, of which free constitutional government Christ announced the principle in the text which I have taken, and of which you and I, fortunately, enjoy the favor and opportunity. What is characteristic of a free constitutional government, a republic or a democracy like our own?

1. First, the people, by their representatives gathered together, have collected and formulated those maxims and first principles of government which make their constitution. This constitution consists of the broadest general laws, under which they propose to live; and a constitution is very slowly modified, because, at the beginning, they have put into it their very best intelligence, and under it allow the very largest liberty. For example, in the Constitution of the United States, aside from other general principles of almost equal value, we have the first amendment saying, "Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof," — a very broad principle, under which all minor legislation concerning religion has to be enacted, and to which it must be conformed. All laws which are made in a constitutional republic are of necessity referred to the constitution, and if they are in harmony with it, they can exist; and if

they are contrary to it they cannot, for the law must conform to this primordial constitutional law. Therefore there can be no irresponsible or reckless legislation under a free government. Moreover, all the laws in such a republic are made by the people or by the representatives of the people. They elect the legislators, and empower them, and say what they shall do, and how they shall do it. Their courts, also, are their own creation, and those courts are compelled to judge according to the constitution and the laws. All who rise to positions of high authority in a constitutional government rise from the people. They have their place by their election and will. The people put them up, and under the constitution they take them down. Now it is under God, and only under God, have any people this right to govern. All must be done in subordination to His law. For example, the law of God is plainly a law of morality. No people, therefore, have a right to form a constitution which defies the law of morality, or does not demand that consideration for one's fellow-citizens which the Ten Commandments embody.

2. What are some of the effects of a constitutional government? What are some of the consequences that grow out of this system of mutual service? No aristocracy inherits any special privilege, and laws are just and equal because one man is worth as much as another. The common welfare, not the welfare of any class, is the purpose of the state; and if ever a constitutional government forgets that all the people are its care, and legislates for a class against the common welfare, it violates its first prin-

ciple. Under a free constitutional government the people are exalted. They are educated because education is a necessity. If one man has a treasure of knowledge, he recognizes the right of another man to the very same treasure. Therefore, all republics, in order to permanence, attend at once to the education of the masses of the people. No army is necessary, except a very small one to take care, as police, of the worst elements of society. Religion is entirely free to the conscience, and must be, unless there be a religion, or what claims to be a religion, which violates every principle of virtue and righteousness. Under a free constitution all religions have rights. The press is free, within very generous limitations. The people's movements are unrestricted. They come and go as they please. People wonder why it is that we Americans are the greatest travellers in the world. It is because it is nobody's business whither or when we go. (Applause.) We go when we please and where we please.

The penalties of the law are all administered with reference to the amelioration of the condition of society, and not out of vengeance or hatred for those who have fallen under its ban. Everywhere there is diffused a growing and general prosperity. Prosperity, like the water, seeks a common level; and the tendency in a free constitutional government is for the prosperity of the few to become the prosperity of all, so that the vast fortunes which are gathered up by a few in one generation, are generally distributed in one or two more, and the general level of the people is raised.

These are a few of the visible results which show the eminent superiority and the remarkable contrast between despotic and free government.

Now, my friends, I have generalized enough, and am ready to call your attention to a specific fact. As I have spoken of despotisms and the conditions of people under them, have you not recognized, all of you, precisely the conditions which we found by the study of their history to exist in all the Mexican, Central American, and South American states? Do you not see by this general survey of the principles underlying all despotisms that a people under this form of tyranny must be in precisely the condition in which we found the Spanish American nations on this continent? And, moreover, in reviewing the characteristics and results of a free constitutional government, do you not see that the natural, necessary, and inevitable consequences are precisely such as we have in our own country? We have here in our land, which is so much more prosperous than all the rest, as we were saying last Sabbath, the results of free constitutional government, as in those lands we have the results of despotic government. And do you not remember that it became very plain to us last Sabbath that the cause of the different condition of Central and South American peoples from those of the United States of North America lay in Romanism? And now we find that the difference between these states and our own is the outgrowth of despotic principles. What is your conclusion? That Romanism and despotism do the very same thing; that Romanism is despotism, always and everywhere. (Loud applause.)

This is the result of our reasonings, but we do not rely solely on one method of proof.

III. We propose to show further that Romanism as a government, in theory and in practice, is despotic; and in order that you may know that I do not speak without careful thought, I beg to give you a valuable quotation to substantiate my position. To-day, turning over the leaves of a book, long after my discourse was prepared, I found a compendium of that remarkable and well-known dissertation on "Protestantism and Catholicism in their relation to the Liberty and Prosperity of Nations," written by the great Professor Lavelêye of Liége, himself a Roman Catholic, or rather a Gallican French Catholic. (I give it in condensed form, certifying to its absolute accuracy.) This distinguished professor, who had studied the history of all nations, says, contrasting Protestantism and Romanism, "Christianity is favorable to liberty; Catholicism is its mortal enemy. So its infallible head affirms, and history supports his assertion. At first a democratic republic, the church became aristocratical, then a constitutional monarchy. To-day she realizes the ideal of the most absolute despotism conceivable. If civil society seeks to mould herself on the model of religious (papal) society, she must be subject to a despotic government." . . .

"The Reformation, on the other hand, being a return to Christianity, tended to give birth to republican and constitutional institutions." I am glad to bring you this strong statement to certify to the broad thought of a prominent Catholic, who told the truth, as so many of them do not and dare not do.

Now when I speak of the Papal system as despotic, let me still further explain that I am speaking of it not as a religion in the sense that you use the word religion, for Romanism is not a religion in the sense in which you use the word. Romanism is a government, a system of government. Every man under its heel knows that, as does every student of its claims. You and I, when we think of religion, think of it as being possible to be lived and taught and enjoyed under any form of constitutional law, but Romanism is a form of control, and of government, not merely of religious sentiment, feeling, or life. Therefore, when we speak of it as a despotism, we mean precisely what we mean when we talk of Russia or Persia as a despotism. We mean that it is a form of despotic control, having all the marks of a despotism in the civil state. Now let me call your attention to some of its claims, as it explains itself. I often regret that I have not the time to fully vindicate all my propositions by quotations from Roman Catholic authorities, for I say nothing here on any occasion but what is certified to by the facts in Roman Catholic constitutions, and by Roman Catholic authorities. 1. What are the claims of Romanism as a system? I do not identify the Roman Catholic here this afternoon with the system. He may be a thoroughly good Christian, and is entitled to the most brotherly treatment from me and from you, whether he is a Christian or no. But when I talk of the Romanist system, I talk of that despotism which tries to crush him, and tries to crush us all. (Applause.)

What, then, are its claims? It claims absolute

supremacy over all nations; over all rulers, kings, queens and presidents. It claims absolute authority over all legislators and all legislation, and all law and all courts of law, claiming to be the highest and final court. There is no legislature which has a right, according to Romanism, to legislate in any way contrary to her will. It claims absolute authority over every individual, whether he be Romanist or Protestant. It asserts despotic control of all social relations, claiming to have the sole and only right to create the family or dismember it.

It claims supreme authority over all the utterances of men, whether those utterances be in books or periodicals, or in the form of vocal speech. It denies absolutely every man's right to say or to print anything, excepting what it indorses and what it controls. It denies, further, all right of private opinion and judgment, asserting its right to control all opinion, all judgment, all conscience, all feeling and action, however private. All this may be proven from the highest authority, from the Encyclical and the Syllabus of Pope Pius IX. More than I have said, Rome claims. It claims to be as supreme over men as God is, representing Him, and, therefore, having absolute right of control over everything and everybody in this world. To give you proof that this is true, I have here on the table (I brought the book for its moral effect) a book in which the Encyclical and the Syllabus of Pope Pius IX., shortly before he was declared infallible, are given in full. I have looked over this Encyclical and Syllabus, and the numbers which I have on the paper before me are the

numbers of the Propositions in the Syllabus, and these are the condensed statement of them. It will take but a few moments to read, and it is of importance that you should know that these are the claims of Romanism as stated by its infallible head and sole authority.

In his Encyclical, first of all, Pope Pius IX. indorses all the popes who went before him. Never did a man do a more risky thing, for if ever earth saw hell turned inside out, it was in the case of the lives and conduct of many of those popes. However, he gave them his indorsement and approval. (Laughter and applause.) He asserts in the Encyclical his right to rule over peoples, nations, and sovereigns; the right of the church, and the duty of the state, to punish all violators of Romanism; he denounces liberty of conscience: declares that civil government has no right to interfere with saints' days (though they may number one hundred and fifty or two hundred, as they do in Italy); he declares that the civil power is subordinate to the church; he curses all secret societies. Outside of faith and morals as well as within that realm, he demands obedience to the Church of Rome: declares that happiness proceeds always and only from the Papacy; that sovereigns should submit to the Papacy; and closes his Encyclical with a remarkably pious appeal to Mary as the queen of heaven and the mediatrix between God and men.

Passing to the Syllabus, these are some of its propositions. I give the numbers so that you may look them up for yourselves.

Proposition 15. Free profession of religion is denied, and those who affirm the right to it are cursed. (A curse goes with every one of these propositions. And a curse is sure to go also with obedience to all the Papal commands.)

Proposition 17. In Rome alone is salvation.

Proposition 18. Protestantism is not true religion.

Proposition 19. Civil power may not limit the church's claims. (That is, the church can claim anything it pleases, and the state has no right to limit its authority.)

Proposition 23. Rome has never exceeded her rights and powers in anything that she has done. (To those who know Roman Catholic history that is an astonishing statement.)

Proposition 24. Rome has the right to avail herself of physical force (to compel obedience to her commands).

Proposition 26. She has in herself the right to property, to acquire and possess it, regardless of civil law.

Proposition 27. Her ministers should control temporal affairs.

Proposition 42. Civil law should not prevail over ecclesiastical law.

Proposition 47. In schools, Rome should have the control.

Proposition 52. Governments have no right to determine at what age people shall become monks and nuns, or to control their actions as to becoming such. And again —

Proposition 53. Government has no right to let

those monks or nuns break their vows. (That is to say, the poor girls who are buried in convents, this government has no right to help, not if they want to get out ever so much. This is the Papal claim.)

Proposition 54. Kings and queens are not superior to the church, or exempt from its jurisdiction.

Proposition 55. Church and state ought to be united.

Proposition 73. Civil marriage (that is, the kind that you and I have had, all of us that were not married by a Catholic priest) is not a true marriage.

Proposition 77. Romanism, excluding all other religions, should be the religion of the state. And again —

Proposition 78. Freedom of worship is denounced.

And the Pope says finally, in the 80th and last proposition, that he is not reconciled to progress and civilization as we have it in modern times, and never will be. I am inclined to think that civilization and progress will go on whether he is reconciled or not. (Applause.)

But now, Dr. Von Dollinger says that all these propositions, the word of the Infallible Pontiff, every Roman Catholic must receive or be guilty of heresy. They are the infallible word of the infallible authority; and when Dr. Von Dollinger himself, after teaching for forty-seven years in the university of Munich, the man most eminent for learning in the entire Roman Catholic Church, — when he declined to accept these infallible dicta, he was excommunicated, and he himself says that his life was thus put at the mercy of any would-be assassin and fanatic in the Roman

Catholic communion. This was what excommunication meant to this eminent man.

Now, further, they extend their commands over everybody and everything. Direct censures are administered to all men if they resist, and punishments are threatened if they decline to obey. Rome admits no rival, no equal whatever, in any realm, whether in authority, legislation, courts of law, conscience, opinions, property; she tolerates no rival, she admits no counter-claim.

2. All this follows naturally from her assumptions. She claims all her authority directly and immediately from God, precisely as every tyrant and despot has been wont to do in the history of the last twenty centuries, and that no other power on earth has like authority from God, — none whatever. Rome has all this authority, and no one else has it. Consequently there is no other authority in the world that is divine as the authority of the Roman Catholic Church is divine. As to the amount of the authority of Rome, the quality and quantity, she herself alone can tell how much of it there is; for nobody knows how much God gave her, except herself, and therefore she alone can define the limits of her power. If she says she has authority in any case, nobody can contradict it, because she knows from divine inspiration. Such is her theory. All this applies to all men, to all governments, to all courts, to all legislatures, to all peoples. The Papal government is wholly irresponsible to anybody: I repeat, the Pope of Rome is wholly irresponsible to anybody. The people cannot correct the church if they think it

goes wrong, because, first, it never can go wrong, and second, if it does, it is none of the people's business.

3. The method of Romanism agrees with its theory, for it proceeds to carry out the same effectually in action. The Pope is the centre of all, an absolute ruler. Dr. Dollinger says in his Declarations and Letters which I have here in hand, from which I would be very glad to read freely, that the Pope has absolute authority over all governments, a dominion which extends over them in secular and political matters. He says on page 35 of his Letters, that the Pope's testimony concerning himself is final. That is, whatever he says about himself you have to believe under pain of heresy. Hitherto the Catholic has said, "I believe this or that doctrine on the testimony of the whole church of all times, because she has the promise that she shall exist forever, and always remain in possession of the truth." But henceforth the Catholic will have to say, "I believe because the Pope, who has been declared infallible, commands it to be taught and believed." Further, he says that the reason why he is excommunicated and cursed himself, is because he "will not certify his belief in the omnipotence and infallibility of the Pope." And finally he declares that included in the infallibility of the Pope is the "whole fulness of power over the whole church, as well as over every individual layman, — a power which is at the same time to be truly episcopal, and again specifically Papal; which is to include in itself all that affects faith, morals, duties of life, and

discipline, and which can, without any mediation whatever, seize and punish, bid and forbid every one, the monarch as well as the laboring man." The Pope is the despot of all.

You ask how is the Pope made? He is chosen by the college of cardinals, of whom there are seventy, nearly all Italians. Who makes the cardinals? The Pope. Who makes the Pope? The cardinals. A close corporation, as you see. (Applause.) Who appoints the bishops? All the bishops are made by the Pope, and although the priests of a diocese have the privilege of nominating three, it happens that the Pope has the right to make anybody bishop whom he pleases, whether nominated or not, as he did in Brooklyn the other day. Moreover, the bishops make and appoint the priests, and place them in full control in their respective parishes. Every priest is completely at the mercy of the bishop, and the people at the mercy of the priest. For the people are enjoined to obey the priests as if the priests were God Himself, under threat of direst penalty here and hereafter. They are absolutely at the mercy of the priests. The people cannot select their priests, they cannot appoint their priests, they cannot send away their priests. It is all in the hands of the bishop; and the only thing which seems left to the people is obedience.

Priests and ecclesiastics are declared amenable to no earthly authority except the Pope. There is a constant protest on the part of Roman Catholic authorities against having priests tried by any except an ecclesiastical court. And this absolute

tyranny is of divine right, whatever the character of any or all of the popes or priests who exercise it, from the earliest to the present. Resistance is rebellion; and I affirm to you solemnly, here and now, from my long and careful researches, that there is no crime which Romanism regards with so much displeasure as disobedience to the priests, the bishops, and the Pope. No crime against morality can be compared to it in enormity, either in their estimation or in their displeasure and vengeance.

But going beyond all other despotisms that ever existed in the history of mankind, Romanism follows the unfortunate object of its wrath into the world to come, and there confines him at the pleasure of its priests in penal fires, or liberates him at the will of the priests, through gifts of money and masses, so holding in chains the unfortunate humanity over which it claims dominance, even in eternity.

In kind its effects are identical with, and in measure far in excess of, the worst tyranny that ever existed on the face of the earth. It is rich: the people are impoverished. It is debauched: the people are degraded morally. It favors classes, and everywhere prostrates the masses. It exercises espionage in the confessional over every home and every family. It destroys liberty and prosperity, — let nations and centuries be the witnesses. It creates superstition and infidelity, and destroys the conscience over which it claims control.

Need I say, then, as I close, that in the Papacy is an antagonist to free constitutional government of the strongest and most hostile character? Can you

see how the government of these United States can ever agree with a system like this? Shall we succumb to it? Shall we yield to its claims? Shall we permit its control in all these departments where it makes such imperious demands? Is there not an emergency upon us, every one, at this hour, when its chief ecclesiastics declare that they intend to make it dominant in America? Is not this an hour for consideration, for study, for reflection, and for nourishing our souls in strength to resist its impudent claims?

There is room in this country under our free constitution for every nationality, for every race, for every color of men that will keep the law. There is room for every form of religion in the United States of America which does not antagonize the government. But there is no room within the limits of our territory or under our constitution for any form of despotism. (Applause, renewed and prolonged.)

ROME'S DESPOTIC INTOLERANCE OF FREE OPINION.

My present discourse is a continuation of that of last Sabbath, and needs no other text than that in which Christ so plainly showed the difference between the absolute despotism which lords it over men to their hurt, and that co-operative association of men in free constitutional government, which is so highly beneficial and so much to their welfare. You will remember that on last Sabbath, after showing what are the principles underlying despotic forms of government, we contrasted their effect upon those nations in which they prevailed with that of free institutions, and made it plain that these principles were destructive of the common welfare. Then having found that those lands in which Romanism is dominant show all those marks of prostration which are the invariable results of despotic control, we concluded that this church was a system of governmental despotism, and showed that in its methods, in its principles, and in its results, Rome was nothing less than a genuinely despotic power.

You will remember also that in the course of this argument, it was made plain that the intellectual life of the people was especially under the iron hand of

despotism, that the education of the common people was never a part of the policy of a tyrannical government, and that in no land on the face of the earth, where her power has been controlling, has Rome ever educated the common people. On the present occasion I wish to pursue still further and more at large this subject of the domination and control of Romanism over the intellectual powers, and to show that despotic intolerance of free opinion, with repression of free expression of such opinion, is a part of her policy.

We have recently said a good deal in regard to the Spanish-American countries of the western world. Permit me to read you a remarkable utterance concerning those countries, in support of the principles which I have just recited. "In New Spain" (that is Mexico, Central and South America) "the tribunals of the Inquisition, which held their sessions at Mexico, Lima, and Carthagena, spent most of their energies in examining and anathematizing books. No books, wherever produced or in whatever language, were permitted to go into circulation till they had been examined by the commissioners of the Holy Office. The crime of selling a forbidden book incurred for the first offence prohibition to the seller to deal in books for two years, banishment from the place where the business had been carried on, and a fine of one hundred ducats. A repetition of the offence brought a heavier punishment. As the fines went into the coffers of the Inquisition, there was a strong temptation to find in the books examined heresy, immodesty, or disrespect of the government. No one was at liberty to use a catalogue of books which he received from

abroad till he had sent it to the Holy Office, which was not bound to restore it. Private individuals were liable to domiciliary visits from the commissioners of the Inquisition, in search of prohibited books, at any hour of the day or night. Permissions to read condemned books were most generally given to priests and monks, but this liberty did not extend to all books. The Spanish Index expurgatorius might vie in comprehensiveness with the Roman: in 1790 it contained no less than five thousand four hundred and twenty authors. Is it any wonder that a people whose intellect was thus stunted and repressed has, even to our time, shown a deplorable incapacity for self-government?" (Lindsay's "Rome in Canada," p. 344.) This will account in large part for the abject condition of those states which we have described quite recently.

But further than this, the doctrine of the control of the church over the mind is carried to such an extraordinary extent that the Jesuits have invented a theory that it is necessary, in order to show reverence for the church, to sacrifice the intellectual powers. I have here Dr. Döllinger's statement ("Declarations and Letters," p. 98) in his discussion of the council of 1870. "When the Jesuits formed the plan of having the papal absolutism raised to an article of faith in Church and State, in doctrine and adminstration" (and by papal absolutism he means the doctrine of infallibility), "they invented, as is well known, the so-called *sacrificio dell' intelletto*, and assured their adherents and disciples, nay actually convinced many, and among them even bishops, that the most beautiful

homage due to God, and the noblest Christian heroism, consists in a man's renouncing his own mental judgment, his self-acquired knowledge, and self-gained power of discernment, and in throwing himself in blind faith into the arms of the infallible 'magisterium' as the only sure source of religious knowledge. In the eyes of countless numbers this Order has, it is true, to a great extent succeeded in raising mental sloth to the dignity of a religious meritorious sacrifice, and sometimes in moving even men, who by their general education would certainly have been well capable of instituting such an historical investigation, to a renunciation of it." In other words, it is almost an article of faith in the Roman Catholic Church that the independent use of the mind according to its own laws is a demerit, and that the sacrifice of your reasoning powers is an act of goodness and piety toward God.

With such a theory before us, stated in such emphatic and impressive language, let us proceed to consider the

I. GENERAL PRINCIPLES CONCERNING FREEDOM OF THOUGHT AND OF EXPRESSION WHICH OUGHT TO GOVERN OUR LIVES.

1. It is not necessary in America and in the presence of an audience like this to dwell at length on the general doctrine of freedom of thought and freedom of expression. We recognize that the human mind was made to see and to know truth and the God of truth, and while the mind's activities are along certain lines known as the laws of thought, the whole universe is open to its inquiries. The knowledge of

truth comes through observation, research, comparison, through reason, and divine revelation, and in all these directions the mind must, and of right ought to be, entirely free to pursue its inquiries subject only to the truth. For gaining this truth the human mind may well put forth its utmost efforts, nor does it ever attain its highest excellence save in the ardent pursuit thereof. The truth may relate to physics, as in the case of Galileo who discovered that the earth moved round the sun rather than that the sun moved round the earth: it may relate to government, as in the case of the fathers of our country whose faith was that a government of the people, for the people, and by the people, was better than the government of a king: it may relate to religion, as when in the time of our Lord the full perfection of Judaism came forth in the better faith of Christianity. But whatever be the subject of thought, the mind has a right, God-given, to think; and I may say where it has a right, it also has a profound obligation. For they have not understood religion at all who suppose that it is to suppress the activity of the human mind: it is rather to enlarge and direct it.

2. In all pursuits where the mind is moving freely, there comes interchange with other minds. Free expression is just as natural as free thought. So conversation and all verbal utterance, printing and writing, and all forms of books and periodicals, literature as well as thought, speech as well as ideas, ought to be absolutely free. I say that it ought to be free when in the pursuit of truth. There is a kind of literature that undoubtedly ought to be sup-

pressed, which merely panders to passion and does not intend to exhibit truth. There is a sort of speech which is contrary to good morals, and so is contrary to good law, but it is not the speech of men who are searching after truth and endeavoring to elucidate it.

3. The result of the suppression of free speech and free opinion is always hypocrisy. Let a man feel that he dare not say what he thinks, because priests and ecclesiastics object, and he will be likely to become a hypocrite in matters of religion. When a man is forbidden to think and speak in matters of religion, he is almost sure to repudiate that religion; and my sympathies are with him when he does it, for I believe the human mind is better free without a religion that represses it, than it is under that religion, however superstitiously devoted to it. If free it will surely seek religion; if suppressed, it will repudiate the oppressor. But truth will always overthrow error. All it wants is a free field. The reason why prejudice controls so largely, why selfish men try to suppress the thought of others, is because they have not faith in truth. When men have faith in truth, they need not fear error; for truth is like the light, and error is like the darkness. However deep the pall that is spread by error over the mind, the rising of the sun of truth will drive away those shadows and give brightness instead of blackness. It will broaden, therefore, our views of truth, to let error do its worst, only let the friends of truth have opportunity for its defence. Let error come into the field if it will, and show cause why it should exist. But let us note that, as a matter of fact, nearly every one

who goes forth in this world to tell the truth is met not by truth and by argument, but by repression and denunciation.

4. Where is the man who has ever risen up with truth which was contrary to the practices of his age and time, who has not been met with indifference, with slander, with denunciation, and with persecution? Do we not know that the Jewish people persecuted the prophets and stoned them that were sent unto them? And why was this? Because, misinterpreting their religion and loving iniquity, they had settled down into superstition and immorality. It has been so in every age and among every people. The prophets of a better day, the men who come telling the truth, always run the ploughshare through old wrongs and hoary abuses, and are met by those who are profiting by such wrongs, with hatred and antagonism, and often with death. How was it in the case of our Lord himself? Was it because he spoke falsely that men desired to crucify him? I read only this very day that Count Tolstoi, the distinguished Russian philanthropist and author, because he had spoken in favor of humanity to starving Russians, had been ordered by the government to remain on his estates, not being permitted to go among the people or to speak the truth about the famine. Why? Had he not spoken the truth? Ought not the famine-stricken peasantry of Russia to have a voice? Ought not some one to speak for them? But the truth is this: if the world knows the tyranny of the Russian czar, the whole world will protest against it, and it does not suit the despots to have Tolstoi tell the truth or go off his estates

endeavoring to improve the condition of the dying people of Russia whom the Government starves. It is the old, old story. Everywhere, in every land, in every clime, at every time, despots, political and ecclesiastical, rather than have free thought and free expression of the truth, will repress and destroy and murder if they can, those that see and tell the truth.

II. Following this wicked principle, Rome has always undertaken to suppress those who did not think and speak as they were told to think and speak by pope and priests. *Now the theory, practice, and policy of Rome is, as I have already said, to suppress free thought and free expression.* This is not merely their course in the past, but it is just as true in the present. I hold in my hand an utterance of the *Roman Catholic Review*, a leading paper in the city of New York, very recently made. It says (the date is the 5th of September, 1891, and this is editorial and therefore official), "Members of the Catholic Church cannot consistently judge for themselves, either in faith, in morals, or in ecclesiastical arrangements. If a man persists in judging for himself, and following his own inclination in opposition to the judgment of the Church, he is not a loyal Catholic." That is the doctrine of Rome in America in 1891 and 1892.

1. The theory of Rome which represses free thought and free speech is that they have all the truth. If any man says, I have truth, and it is not something which the Roman Catholic Church has, it is false, and because false should be suppressed. No matter whether it is Galileo saying that he has found

out that the earth moves, — or Father McGlynn saying that he has found out that public schools are better than parochial, — or Father Lambert saying that there are laymen who are as competent to judge of truth as bishops. It will interest you to know that Rome does not suppose you Protestants to have the truth at all. Is Protestantism truth? I heard a man say the other day that Rome held a great many of the doctrines which we hold, but he forgot that Rome does not admit that. She insists that we have not the truth, that all non Romanists are infidels. Let me read from one who is prominent in that communion and who has a right to speak. Mgr. Gaume, a great authority in the church in Canada, in a catechism of the syllabus which has the approbation of the bishops and of the pope, defines modern Liberalism as a sect which pretends to conciliate the modern spirit with the spirit of the church. "Having asked what are the special points on which Liberalism asks this conciliation he replies: 'liberty of conscience; liberty of worship; liberty of the press; the secularization of politics.' To the next question comes the reply: the Church can never accept such conciliation because 'in sanctioning liberty of conscience and equality of worship, the Church would lose her reason for existence, since it is apparent to the whole world that there is only one true religion.'" That is to say, they cannot tolerate any conscience or any other authority than their own. "'Heresy,' says Father Giovanni Perrone, Professor of Theology at Rome, 'being a crime against the State, ought to be proceeded against by the civil power and the Inquisi-

tion.'" That is, it has no right to exist. You and I ought to be suppressed in all our religious life by the civil State.

2. Father Braün, a Jesuit priest in Canada, in a work highly approved by Canadian bishops, says, —

"It is customary to regard Protestantism as a religion which has rights. This is an error. Protestantism is not a religion: Protestantism has not a single right. It is a rebellion in triumph; it is an error which flatters human nature. Error can have no rights: rebellion can have no rights," etc.

The Pope is declared, by the bishops of Quebec, to be the supreme legislator, that is to say over all legislators, he determines what is right, and if they permit liberty of worship and he denies it, why they are wrong and he is right. Moreover, I find the astonishing statement made by a prominent Roman Catholic paper in the city of Rome, that the Pope is the supreme judge, the chief justice in all judicial affairs. Let me read precisely the statement which they make. The *Civilta* of March 18th, 1871, says, "The Pope is the chief justice of the Civil Law. In him the two powers, the spiritual and temporal, meet together as in their head; for he is the vicar of Christ, whc is not only Eternal Priest, but also King of kings and Lord of lords:" and a little farther on: "The Pope, by virtue of his high dignity, is at the head of both powers." — that is, both legislative and judicial. He is the supreme court, and therefore what he says is judicially final. Now, those who do not submit to this ecclesiastical court are subjects of excommunication; for I have here, and might read,

the distinct statement of the bishops of Canada, that if a layman cites an ecclesiastic before any civil court that layman is subject to excommunication. Why? Because those ecclesiastical courts have supreme rights, and therefore the civil courts have no rights over ecclesiastics to hear or judge causes.

When this supreme authority acts in matters of opinion or expression it must be obeyed. For example, as to the Index which proscribes books as not being proper to be read on account of opinions condemned by the papacy: the papal claim is, that if a book is put on the Index, not only has no Romanist a right to read it, but no Protestant has a right to read it. That is to say, if there are books in our library which are on the Index (and a great many of them are) you as Protestants have no right to read those books because you are forbidden by the Pope of Rome. That is the theory of the Church, and they cannot hold any other theory, inasmuch as they assume that they have all truth and we have none but what they indorse.

3. When it comes to the matter of tolerance or intolerance, I must give you the benefit of their exact statements. I find that in relation to Protestantism statements are made like the following. The Abbe Paquet, who was Professor in the University of Laval in Canada, says, "To say that it is possible to find salvation in different religions, whether they be called Catholic, Greek schismatic, Lutheran, or Calvinistic, this is religious or theological toleration." In the mouth of an individual, this doctrine, the students are told, is blasphemous and absurd. On the lips of a

sovereign or the administrators of a government, it is an error and an impiety. Everywhere and at all times the principle of religious toleration is to be a subject of ecclesiastical censure.

In "Plain Talk about the Protestantism of To-day," a Catholic book published in Boston, we find expressions like these: "The freedom of thinking is simply nonsense. . . . *Freedom of thought* is the soul of Protestantism. . . . It is the same with liberty of conscience. . . . The Catholic Church alone, in the midst of so many different sects, avers a possession of absolute truth, out of which there cannot be true Christianity: *she alone has a right to be, she alone must be, intolerant.* She alone will and must say, as she has said through all ages in her councils, "*If any one saith or believeth contrary to what I teach, which is truth,* LET HIM BE ANATHEMA!"

I might read to you for an hour the authoritative statements of Rome to the effect that you have no right to think, and have no right to be a Protestant, and have no right to hold any of the forms of religion or truth that you hold, unless you get that right through the sanction of the Pope.

III. But now comes the question as to what Rome would do in this country if she had the opportunity. If we were simply discussing a Romanism that had ceased to exist, if we were bringing to your attention ideas that were old and long since outworn, then our time might be better employed. But if Romanism to-day holds precisely the position she has always held; if she would, provided she had the power in this country, do precisely as she has

always done, and as she now claims the right to do; if the United States would be Mexicanized provided Romanism had the power to do it; if we should become like Spain and Central America provided Rome had control, — then there is certainly reason enough why we should consider and remonstrate. This I believe to be the fact; and I bring you certain very recent cases to show that Roman Catholicism is intolerant to-day in these United States, both of free thought and free expression.

1. The first case that I will cite is that of the learned Dr. Von Döllinger, of Bavaria, who died January 10, 1890. He was born in 1799, was ordained a priest in 1822, was made a professor of church history and theology shortly after, and for the space of nearly seventy years was the leading light in the great university at Munich. Though a Catholic, in 1851 he advocated the separation of church and state, and in 1861 advised the Pope to abandon the temporal power. When the attempt was made to create the doctrine of papal infallibility in 1869, Von Döllinger remonstrated against it. The final result of his remonstrances was, that he was excommunicated, and that he died outside of the Roman Catholic Church, being one of the founders of what was called the Old Catholic Church in Germany, a return to the primitive Christianity. From his "Declarations and Letters" we readily gather the grounds of his resistance to papal Rome and the grounds on which he was excommunicated.

All he claimed was the right to think, and to speak according to his thought of the truth. He gives the

following reasons, among hundreds of others, why papal infallibility should not be made a law and dogma of the Church. He says it was unknown for many centuries; that Thomas Aquinas introduced it in the thirteenth century and supported it by forgeries, — and over and over again he affirms that many of the doctrines of Rome rest on forged documents and lying testimonies, and that any fair spirit of historical research will find that their very foundations are thoroughly honey-combed by these falsehoods. He declares when Pope Agatho, 680 A.D., claimed infallibility by perverting Luke xxii. 32, there was no acceptance of it. Historically the doctrine is erroneous, because some of the popes have been heretics, as for instance the pope Honorius, who was condemned for heresy. Intolerance and the suppression of all other faiths since the thirteenth century has been demanded as a duty, and he says it would be lifted to the rank of a dogma hereafter if this dogma of infallibility is affirmed. Infallibility, he says, demands the sanction of the Inquisition by all Roman Catholics. The preponderance of scholarship is all against papal absolutism. The Jesuits are its champions: these champions always rested their case on false testimony. It was opposed by the University of Paris for 400 years. He remonstrates that the Vatican council of 1870 was not free; that the order of business was prepared by the Pope, and that the bishops had no opportunity to freely express themselves; and then he goes on to say that he will prove the new decrees contrary to the constitution of the civil state as well as the Church.

After he had spoken thus his bishop threatened that he would exercise his power against him. Whereupon Döllinger says, "If you intend to make use of your Episcopal power over me, I may still, I think, hope that it is the best, the noblest, the most beneficial attribute of that power, and the one the most Christlike, I mean the teaching office, that you will prefer to exercise upon me first. Should I be convinced by evidence and facts, I herewith bind myself to make a public recantation." But the power of teaching was the very last that they thought of exercising against him. The bishop threatens to employ certain severity against the learned and reasonable professor, to which he answers that he cannot be a hypocrite, that he has thoroughly re-examined all his positions, that he is satisfied of their truth, and that the falsity of the doctrine of infallibility is proved to a demonstration. He will not, as many bishops have done, perjure himself and give his sanction to what he knows and they know to be false.

Then he challenges the bishops to come and debate with him on this matter; and the only conditions that he desires are that the words spoken may all be taken down, and that "a man of scientific training of my own choice may be present at the conference." The archbishop refused to have the question presented in debate, on the ground that it would put the voice of history above the edict of the Church! That is to say, if a man prove the doctrines of Rome absurd from history, it would raise history above the Church! How strange it seems to a lover of truth,

to have such an objection as this presented to free debate. The archbishop declares that to reject infallibility is heresy, that excommunication will follow. Von Döllinger noted the threat, but stood firm, and then the greater excommunication was pronounced against him. Fourteen times they reported that the old hero had surrendered and had given up to the Pope, and fourteen times he stood forward and said the report was false; that as long as his intellect remained clear, and as long as he knew truth from falsehood, he would resist the doctrine of papal infallibility. The Vatican decrees he had proved false to a demonstration; and he said that having taught for about sixty years the truth against papal infallibility, he could not deny that history was true, on the sole authority of the Pope of Rome. When some suggested that he was deranged, he offered to prove to them whether or not he knew what he was about in any fair way. He refused to change his faith, and says that the Church regarded this as a greater crime than immorality. If he had done something outrageous in the line of morals, Rome would have forgiven him; but because he would not change his faith, at the dictate of the Church, they would not tolerate this grand old man within its communion. He was excommunicated; and he says that in that excommunication, they made it possible for any fanatic to kill him with the sanction of the Church.

This was since 1870, and in the case of one of the most eminent scholars in the world. Is Rome's method outworn? Has she ceased to persecute free

opinion? Certainly not. And except the police of Munich had given warning and protection to this their most eminent citizen, he says he would have been murdered because excommunicated; and for the same cause they assured him, in their infinite charity, that when he died he would be condemned to go to hell forever!

Facts like these, occurring before our eyes, we must not pass over. All that this man wanted was the truth. And the answer was that, When the Pope says that a thing is true, it is true. How absurd!

2. But come to a case in our own country. Von Döllinger's offence was true thought in a matter of theological opinion. You all know the case of Dr. McGlynn. Dr. McGlynn is now in middle life. Born of Irish parents, educated in the common schools, he studied nine years in Rome, came back to the city of New York and became a priest. From the first, he was distinguished by his urbanity, his eloquence, and his love of the people. A few years ago, when the effort was made to build parochial schools all over this country, Father McGlynn, at that time pastor of St. Stephen's Church, in New York, said that in his opinion the public schools were better for the children, and he declined to give his influence and his efforts to the erection of parochial schools. This was his first offence. His next offence was, as a champion of temperance, to go on the platform with Protestant ministers, as with Mr. Beecher and Dr. Crosby, and plead for temperance. This was an offence against Tammany Hall and Rum rule in New York, and was afterwards urged against him by

Archbishop Corrigan. But finally, in the great city of New York, observing the woes of so many thousands of people who suffer, and wondering what could be done to relieve them, Father McGlynn thought that some modification of the social and property system would be an advantage. He did not dictate. He came on to the platform and said what he thought in the way of persuasion. He spoke in favor of a certain social system which was not revolutionary, simply a modification of the present order. And this in loyal devotion to the common welfare. All this was extremely hateful to the Church, and Father McGlynn was summoned to Rome. He knew what that meant. He knew that if he went to Rome he would be suppressed and his manhood trampled under foot, whether truth was on his side or not. He declined to go. He was excommunicated, and driven out of his church in New York, and almost every Sabbath now for some years, Father McGlynn, before vast audiences in New York and elsewhere, has been preaching the truth as he understands it. His old parish is divided in twain. Not very long ago the finances of this parish were so low that they had a fair in the interests of the church, and sold liquor freely at this fair to make money to keep up its spiritual interests (laughter); but Father McGlynn does not believe in that sort of thing. (Applause.) He is to-day an outlawed priest. Why? Because he entertains different ideas of education and of social life from those which are entertained by the Pope of Rome. That is in America, and he an American citizen, as prominent as the most prominent priest in

this city; but he is an ecclesiastical outlaw, under doom of perdition, because he will not think on educational and social questions as he has been commanded to think.

3. Now let me call your attention to another case totally different, and yet alike in this respect, that Rome will not tolerate truth or manhood against her commands. Dr. Richard Lalor Burtsell was the intimate friend of Father McGlynn, a man of large learning, and especially distinguished for his knowledge of theology and canon law. Dr. Burtsell naturally advised somewhat with Dr. McGlynn as friend with friend. Some four years ago, in February, 1888, a man named John McGuire, being present at one of Father McGlynn's meetings, before the meeting was opened, fell suddenly dead. John McGuire had owned a lot in Calvary Cemetery, which is under the care of Archbishop Corrigan, and of course at his death his children desired to place his body in that cemetery. Archbishop Corrigan of New York interfered, saying that all who were attending Dr. McGlynn's meetings were excommunicated, and because they were excommunicated could not be buried in consecrated ground. So John McGuire's children brought a suit-at-law against the archbishop, to compel him to permit them to bury their dead in their own lot in Calvary Cemetery. Dr. Burtsell was a witness on that occasion, and in the course of his testimony he said that to deny to McGuire the right of sepulture in his own lot in Calvary Cemetery was contrary to the canon law. George Bliss, Esq., the counsel for Archbishop Corrigan, questioned the wit-

ness closely, and finally called him a rebel against the Church. Now, when Dr. Burtsell declared, in accordance with his knowledge of canon law, a simple matter of fact, that Corrigan was wrong and that McGuire was right, he began to suffer persecution, and to-day, having been removed from his beautiful church in New York, he is at Rondout, on the Hudson. His offence was that, as a witness in court, he told the truth about the canon law. He had no right to tell that truth, it seems, when it militates against the will of the Church. Is this freedom, or slavery?

Monsignor Preston at that same trial said that Roman Catholics must obey their bishops whether right or wrong. This excited amazement in the court, and the question was repeated; and Monsignor Preston answered, "They must obey, right or wrong." He was asked whether a priest was bound to obey the canon law, or the orders of his superior, when the two conflicted? "He should obey the orders of his superior," said Mr. Preston. "Whether right or wrong?" asked the lawyer. "Whether right or wrong," was the startling answer of the Vicar General of New York.

4. The case of Father Lambert of Waterloo, New York, and his bishop, McQuaid, of Rochester, is equally in point. Father Lambert had been twenty years a priest in Waterloo, was a man of unusual scholarship and character, so that Protestants and Papists alike believed in him. Publishing a paper in Waterloo he criticised the action of a bishop in allowing a poor insane priest to be taken to the poorhouse, fell under ecclesiastical censure, soon found

himself the object of persecution, was taken away from his church, denied a parish, was left out in the cold, you might say, to starve. What was his offence? He had criticised one in authority, gained the day with him in argument, and when both finally went to Rome, while it was decided that McQuaid must give him some sort of a church, the bishop was upheld. No one must criticise authority in the Roman Catholic Church. His subsequent history has been a painful one, and will no doubt continue to be so.

5. But is the press of this country free, so far as Rome can control it? I have here a letter written by Archbishop Corrigan to the editor of the *Catholic Herald;* and that you may know precisely the attitude which the prelates and priests of Rome take toward the press, let me read. This is in 1887.

452 Madison Ave., New York,
April, 13, 1887.

Editor and Proprietor of Catholic Herald:

Gentlemen, — By this note, which is entirely private, and not to be published, I call your attention to the fact that the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, following the leadership of Leo XIII., has pointed out the duties of the Catholic press, and denounced the abuses of which journals styling themselves Catholic are sometimes guilty. "That paper alone," says the Council (decree No. 228), "is to be regarded as Catholic that is prepared to submit in all things to ecclesiastical authority."

Later on it warns all Catholic writers against presuming to attack publicly the manner in which a bishop rules his diocese. For some time past the utterances of the *Catholic World* have been shockingly scandalous. As this newspaper is published in this diocese, I hereby warn you that if you continue in this course of conduct, it will be at your peril.

I am, gentlemen, yours most truly,

M. A. Corrigan, *Archbishop of New York.*

That is to say, if the editor offends the archbishop, it is at his peril. What will Corrigan do? What is the peril? Why, he will simply outlaw and boycott the paper and ruin the publisher. That is the way it is done.

But here is another case, that of Owen Smith and Archbishop Elder, of Cincinnati, which illustrates the attitude of this church to a free press. Our extracts are from the *New York Mail and Express*, and we give the correspondence quite fully that there may be no mistaking the attitude of Roman Catholicism to an untrammelled press.

CINCINNATI, O., July 27, 1889.

OWEN SMITH, ESQ., PUBLISHER OF THE CATHOLIC TELEGRAPH:

Dear Sir, — In the *Catholic Telegraph* of July 18 appeared an article, copied from another paper, criticising a supposed action of the bishops in the last Provincial Council of Cincinnati. It was on the editorial page and in editorial type, in the first column.

In the issue of July 25 appeared two original articles, likewise among the editorial matter, of which the first was calculated to bring odium both on the administration of the diocese and on a number of the clergy; referring individually to one of the most meritorious and most venerable priests among us. The second article contained some sentences injurious to the clergy of the diocese, and even unfavorable to the memory of the dead whom it was intended to eulogize.

On a previous occasion I drew your attention to the admonitions addressed by the Sovereign Pontiff to Catholic journalists about the spirit that must guide them and the transgressions they must avoid. Since then the third plenary council of Baltimore has forbidden, in very strong language, that either clergy or laity should assail any ecclesiastical persons, particularly those who are in ecclesiastical dignity, by offensive words in the public papers or other publications. It declares that those who publish such things are "disturbers of the peace, enemies of ecclesiastical authority, and promoters of most grievous scandal."

Now, then, in discharge of my duty as Archbishop of Cincinnati,

I call on you to publish in the *Catholic Telegraph* of this coming week (Aug. 1), in the usual place and type of editorial matter, a declaration of your regret for each of the three articles mentioned above; your retraction of all injurious assertions contained in them; and your express promise that hereafter you will not allow anything to appear in the paper which may contravene either the admonition of the Sovereign Pontiff or the prohibition of the Council of Baltimore.

It will be necessary to let me see the declaration and promise before it is published, that I may be satisfied of its sufficiency.

In case you should not think proper to comply with this requirement, it will become my duty to take what other measures may be needed to abate the scandal.

Very respectfully, your servant in Christ,

WILLIAM HENRY ELDER, *Archbishop of Cincinnati.*

CINCINNATI, O., July 29, 1888.

MOST REV. W. H. ELDER:

Most Reverend Dear Friend, — Yours of the 27th inst. is received and contents noted. In reply would say that, owing to the nature of the articles referred to, I do not consider myself competent to speak on the subject, and for the further reason that I am now under the care of a physician and have been for the last three weeks. I will therefore say to your Grace that the columns of my paper are open to you to say what you please in regard to the articles referred to over your signature.

I would respectfully call the attention of your Grace to the fact that the publication of the *Catholic Telegraph* is the only means of support for myself and family. Your most obedient servant,

OWEN SMITH, *Per George A. Sturm.*

(Dictated by Owen Smith.)

CINCINNATI, O., July 29, 1889.

OWEN SMITH, PUBLISHER CATHOLIC TELEGRAPH:

Dear Sir, — Your favor of this date is received. I sympathize sincerely with you in your sickness. But the offence given to religion makes necessary a prompt reparation. And a bodily ailing need not hinder a well-disposed man from making honorable amends for an injury done, whether intentional or unintentional. You can spare yourself the labor of writing by simply publishing

in full my letter of the 27th inst. in the editorial columns, and following it immediately by these or equivalent words:—

"As publisher of the *Catholic Telegraph* I hereby comply with the requirements of the above letter. I regret the appearance of the articles referred to. I retract (or, if you choose, 'disavow') all the injurious assertions and inferences contained in them; and I make the required promise, which I will keep loyally and honorably as long as I am connected with the paper." Sign your name.

In offering me the use of your columns, you forget our respective positions. I am not arguing a case as litigant; I am giving judgment as bishop. Whether any of the things said in these articles are true or false, the publishing of them is an act which the Council of Baltimore prohibits as disturbing of peace, hostile to ecclesiastical authority, and productive of grievous scandal. As bishop of the diocese, then, my duty requires me to adhere to my demand that a sufficient reparation—of which I am to judge—be made in the first issue of the paper Aug. 1.

I would be very sorry to lessen in any degree the support of yourself and your family. It is for yourself to judge whether you choose to gain that support by conducting a Catholic paper, according to the rules and the spirit of the Catholic church. If you so conduct your paper as to disturb the head, assail authority, and give scandal, you surely do not expect that your family should be a valid plea for the bishop to give the sanction of his silence. Rather ought the interests of your family to plead with yourself, and induce you to so conduct your paper as to merit the support of loyal Catholics and the blessing of God.

Very respectfully, your faithful servant in Christ,

WILLIAM HENRY ELDER, *Archbishop of Cincinnati.*

Thereupon the poor sick editor, knowing full well that the threat of his high mightiness meant an entire boycott of his paper unless he did so, submits at the foot of the decree in the following language:—

I cheerfully subscribe my name to the following disavowal so kindly dictated by his Grace:—

"As publisher of the *Catholic Telegraph*, I hereby comply with the requirements of the above letter. I regret the appearance of

the articles referred to. I retract (or, if you choose, 'disavow') all the injurious assertions and inferences contained in them, and I make the required promise, which I will keep loyally and honorably as long as I am connected with the paper."

OWEN SMITH.

A card also appeared from Rev. D. O'Meara, who had edited the paper during Mr. Smith's illness, as follows: —

A CARD.

It appears that our article "In Memoriam," published in last week's edition of the *Telegraph*, has given offence to the archbishop and some of the priests of the diocese. The words complained of, as far as we can learn, are: "Almost all the priests of the diocese are looking for big parishes. There is no concealing the fact. It seems to be a perfect mania among them," etc.

With regard to these words, or any other words in the article referred to, supposed to give offence to anybody, we beg to retract and make an apology. We do so for the sake of charity and goodwill among brethren, and to avoid scandal. The words were used merely as one of those little pleasantries which are sometimes unavoidable in all hastily written articles. No offence was intended, and it is deeply to be regretted that an offence was taken. Of the rest we have nothing to say.

D. O'MEARA, *Pastor of St. Andrew's.*

July 31, 1889.

Here you perceive that freedom of the press is absolutely forbidden, and no sooner does a Roman Catholic editor print anything that the authorities of the Church do not approve, than he is threatened and compelled to retract.

Let me give you another instance. Bishop Gilmour of Cleveland, now deceased, who was once a Presbyterian, had some difficulty in 1889 with certain priests in his diocese, one of whom was named Quigley, the other Primeau. The *Catholic*

Knight, a Roman Catholic paper published in Cleveland, took the side of the priests. Bishop Gilmour was very much offended. Finally he excommunicated the editor of the *Catholic Knight* and all his readers and subordinates. Bishop Gilmour, for some reason or other not getting all that he desired in the controversy, wrote a letter to Archbishop Elder of Cincinnati about the way in which Rome was treating the case, and protesting very earnestly against it. The editor of the *Catholic Knight* obtained the letter, got it into court, and finally had it printed. It was a letter that any man might write who was a free man and wanted his rights. Why did Bishop Gilmour tremble when the letter was thus made public in which he had found fault with Rome, retract what he had said in a letter which reads as follows: "Last week the *Catholic Knight* published a copy of a private and confidential letter written by me to the Archbishop of Cincinnati, and by an oversight read in the Court of Common Pleas, Toledo, Ohio. The court stenographer, James E. Emery, pledged his word that no one would ever get a copy of said letter from his notes, and the court forbade its use in the suit before the court. To prevent as much as possible the evil intended by the publication of this letter through the malice of Joseph J. Greeves and his clique of clerical counsellors and backers, I hereby and by these presents withdraw every word in said letter of apparent disrespect to Rome, and every word that could be construed as a doubt of Rome." Signed, "Richard Gilmour, Bishop of Cleveland, October 16, 1890." That is recent enough, is it not, to show us

the relation in which these men, even bishops, stand to the papal power. They are all slaves, and they get their satisfaction by making slaves of those below them.

But I have already detained you too long. My only purpose was to make it perfectly clear from recent history and from indubitable proofs that the attitude of Rome toward free thought and free speech is an attitude absolutely despotic and repressive. I have only begun on my proofs: I have at hand as many more, and they are equally convincing. We ourselves are suffering from the suppression of legitimate facts in this very city because of the dread of the Papal power by our newspapers and people.

There has been founded by Roman Catholics in this country what is called the "Apostolate of the Press," an association whose business it is to get control of the papers of this country. They openly announce it. There is proof enough of their success. I glory in their courage. I wish Protestants had as much,— and if we have not the spirit to maintain our independence, let them trample upon us until the spirit of our fathers wakes in us. (Applause.)

Why do people question as to whether one has a right to speak plainly and truthfully concerning this despotic Papal power? Why do timid Protestants tremble before the possible boycott of Romanism? Why is one's name thought to be almost synonymous with fanatic if he tells the historic and eternal truth concerning this hoary despotism? It is because the heel of Rome is on us, even here in Massachusetts. It is because freedom of opinion and freedom of

speech are in peril here and to-day. It is because the community is careless, and Rome is gaining the ascendency. I say to you in the name of history which never falsifies, in the name of truth as clear as the sun in heaven, that the despotic power claimed by Rome is forever incompatible with free intelligence and with its free expression. (Applause.)

THE INQUISITION, AN ESSENTIAL PART OF PAPAL DESPOTISM.

TEXT: Proverbs xii. 10. "The tender mercies of the wicked are cruel."

THE name of the Roman Catholic Inquisition has been a symbol of unspeakable cruelty for many centuries. It has always been, and must always be, a part of that despotic system which assumes to dictate to conscience, to thought, to word, and to deed.

Cruelty is declared in our text to be the mark of wickedness. No cruelties in the history of the most savage of mankind can surpass those which Roman Catholic hierarchies, in the name of the gracious religion of Christ, have perpetrated on mankind. Not the fierce savagery of the American aborigines; nor the human sacrifices of the Mexican Aztecs; not the slaughters of Druidic priests, nor the fierceness of Cossacks on the steppes of Russia; neither the barbarities of ancient Scythians nor of modern Persians, the bloodthirstiness of the Moors, nor the reckless cruelty of African savages; nor the utter disregard of human suffering shown by Asiatic despots — have equalled, in the diversity of methods employed to inflict human suffering, or in the numbers of those

who have fallen victims to their cruelty, the recorded but unspeakable horrors of the Roman Catholic Inquisition.

Every savage art, the utmost ingenuity of torture, disregard of every principle of justice in apprehending, confining, interrogating, torturing, and killing its victims, have been employed, with the studied and pitiless improvements of centuries, and practised without remorse or apology, to enslave the mind, the conscience, and the heart of the world.

It is not my purpose so much to review the voluminous history of Romish cruelty, scattered as it is through ages of time and through the annals of many nations, as it is to show that this dread and horrid tribunal is inseparable from the papal government; that it is, therefore, a present as well as a past part of the machinery of that church, and must remain such in the future; that the church in itself is responsible for all that the Inquisition has ever done, being herself its originator, procurer, and executor; and also that the ascendency of Rome means the ascendency of persecution in its various forms, in order to the establishment of its authority. Therefore such ascendency should be resisted by every lawful and proper means by any people who cherish freedom.

Why should I tell you of a history with which the whole world is familiar? Why dwell on the dread figures which sum up the overthrow and desolation of nations? I might repeat that in the first eighteen years of the Spanish Inquisition, under Torquemada, 10,220 persons were burned, and 97,000 imprisoned, banished, and reduced to want. "In the Nether-

lands, under the Emperor Charles V., who was not a bigot, and before Philip II. began harsher measures, the victims of the Inquisition, burned, strangled, buried alive, were estimated at from a minimum of 50,000 to a maximum of over 100,000;" 100,000 Albigenses were tortured and burned to death, — 500 men, women, and children being buried alive on suspicion of heresy at one time; by the revocation of the Edict of Nantes 700,000 Christian people were exiled from France; by the massacre of St. Bartholomew, 70,000 were slaughtered without mercy. The Inquisition in Peru tortured to death 100,000 victims. And these are but suggestions and instances of the uncounted thousands upon whom were perpetrated the revolting atrocities devised by the Pope and his prelates.

Read in Limborch's "History of the Inquisition" the story of its origin seven hundred years ago, of its establishment and progress in France, Spain, Italy, Portugal, Poland, Sicily, Sardinia, Germany, Holland, and other parts of the world. It describes its ministers and methods, its vicars, assistants, notaries, judges, and other officials; the power of the inquisitors, and their manner of proceeding. It unveils their dread tribunal, opens their blood-stained records, describes their dungeons, the secret tortures they inflicted, the extreme, merciless, unmitigated tortures, and also the public so-called "acts of faith," or burning of heretics. No secrets could be withheld from the inquisitors; hundreds of persons were often apprehended in one day, and, in consequence of information resulting from their examinations under

torture, thousands more were apprehended. Prisons, convents, even private houses, were crowded with victims; the cells of the Inquisition were filled and emptied again and again; its torture-chamber was a hell. The most excruciating engines were employed to dislocate the limbs of even tender women. Thousands were burned at the stake. The gospel was gagged and crushed, and Christ himself, in the persons of his members, subjected to the anguish of a second Golgotha.

Of this terrific enginery of government, kept in operation so long as the Pope held sway over any territory which he could govern as he liked, I wish to show not the past history so much as its present necessity, in order to the execution of Rome's plans. I purpose to show exactly from their own words, laws, and usages, what the papal church believes, employs, and practises, in the way of cruelty to humanity, under the guise of tender mercy and concern for their souls. For, with a revolting hypocrisy, all that she has ever done has been done under the claim that she represents the merciful Christ, and is doing his will under his immediate orders.

The papal principles demand the Inquisition; the principle of unchangeableness; of authority, as they define it; of infallibility, which justifies all the record of the past as being indisputably right, and also the present laws of the church. To the proof of this I now address myself.

I have briefly glanced at the history of the Inquisition. I shall show most fully that it was originated, justified, and supported by the popes and prelates.

This being shown, you see at once that according to to the papal claim, that the church is always the same: they not only approved of all this past conduct at the time, but insist on holding the same relation to it now that they have ever done. It is the church that has repeatedly defined heresy and declared it to be worthy of death. It is the approved officers of the church who have asserted their authority to put to death all heretics. The inquisitors and their familiars have been officers whom the church has appointed, supported, blessed, and canonized. The buildings of the Inquisition, its dungeons, its instruments of torture, were and are the property of the church. So, then, if the church is unchangeable, as they everywhere assert, what they have been they are now; what they have done they would do to-day; justifying their past, they would make it present; and the only escape from this conclusion is for them to repudiate their dogmas, their popes, their laws, and their history.

The Roman Catholic Church, asserting the principle of authority over all persons and in all respects, enforces that authority by claiming to be, and being, utterly intolerant of all other religions and opinions. "Since the thirteenth century, no principle or doctrine has been enforced with greater emphasis and more frequently repeated by the popes in their circular letters, bulls, and enactments, than the doctrine that it is a divine commandment and sacred duty of every monarch and every government to make use of the power that is given them for suppressing those who avow a different creed, and to permit

no freedom in matters of faith and divine service. The dogma of infallibility is at the same time a declaration of the divine truth of the doctrine that Catholic princes and states, so far as they possess the necessary power, are also bound, as a matter of conscience, to tolerate no other but the Catholic confession, as far as possible to keep back from official positions those who differ from it, to undermine their Christian associations, and finally to extirpate them." "Intolerance is to be enforced wherever there is the power to enforce it. A measure of toleration may be allowed wherever the government is not strong enough to withhold it." They officially declare that the state is not judge in matters of religion, and when it allows civil liberty of worship, it usurps a right which belongs to the spiritual power. To authorize the liberty of different forms of worship is called immoral. The archbishop of St. Louis is reported to have uttered these words: —

"Heresy and unbelief are crimes, and in Christian countries, as in Italy and Spain, for instance, they are punished as other crimes."

From a Roman Catholic paper called the *Shepherd of the Valley*, St. Louis, is taken this sentence: —

"Protestantism of every kind, Catholicity inserts in her catalogue of mortal sins. She endures it when and where she must; but she hates it, and directs all her energies to effect its destruction."

The Boston *Pilot*, under its late editor, who has been so unduly extolled by Protestants, made this announcement: —

"There can be no religion without the Inquisition, which is wisely designed for the promotion of the true faith."

Pope Pius IX. says, —

"The absurd and erroneous doctrines, or ravings in defence of liberty of conscience, are a most pestilential error, a pest of all others most to be dreaded in a state. Cursed be those who assert the liberty of conscience and worship, and all such as maintain that the church may not employ force."

The maintenance of the authority here claimed can never exist without all the cruelties of the Inquisition.

Moreover, on the fundamental dogma of the infallibility of the Pope is based the fullest justification of the Inquisition. If the present pope of Rome is infallible, its past popes have been equally so; and their deeds have, therefore, the fullest sanction and justification. If, then, they created, maintained, and encouraged the Inquisition, it is as wholly justifiable as any dogma of their faith. And that they did this we now proceed to show.

Pope Paul IV., who was as energetic as he was cruel, published a brief on the 15th of February, 1558, charging Valdez, the Grand Inquisitor of Spain, to destroy "utterly all Protestants and friends of Protestantism, though they might be bishops, archbishops, cardinals, nuncios, or barons, counts, dukes, princes, kings, or kaisers." So ran the words of His Holiness. And Valdez carried them out but too willingly.

Pope Clement XI. preached a general crusade in 1702, and granted plenary absolution to all who should take up arms for the extermination of "this cursed and loathsome brood," the Protestants of France. Thus the salvation of Roman Catholic murderers was made to depend on their slaughter of protesting Christians who denied the falsities of Romanism.

Pope Eugenius IV. began his reign in 1431 by causing a crusade to be preached against the Bohemians throughout all Europe, so that an end, "once for all, might be made of the heretics." The inducements offered the crusaders were great. Not only were they authorized to rob and plunder, but even "commanded to do so as a pious duty." They did their horrible work, assured that the uprooting of heresy was a work agreeable to God, performing deeds so dreadful that the tongue refuses to describe them.

Innocent III., greatest of the popes, unless it were Gregory VII., in the first of his pontificate, despatched his legate, Reiner, to Spain and the southern provinces of France, charging him with an encyclical letter to all the princes, barons, bishops, etc., prescribing the sternest measures against the heretics. As a preliminary step, he at once commanded the arrest of every known heretic, and the confiscation of their possessions. The children of a heretic were made to share their parents' ruin. The house in which a heretic had taken refuge was, by the same decree, commanded to be razed to the ground. "No one, from mistaken charity, shall give succor or aid to one of the accused, under penalty of incurring suspicion of sharing his sin. The nearest ties of blood or friendship shall be held no ground for excuse. An oath sworn to an heretic shall be null and void, for no one is bound to hold faith with, but rather in every way to deceive, mislead, and circumvent him."

"In a long series of bulls and decrees," says Von Döllinger, "more than fifty popes established the institution of the Inquisition, or the Sacred Office. They

restored it only a few years ago, after it had been suppressed in papal states by the Interregnum, and but recently they have again extolled it on occasion of the canonization of some inquisitors. For several centuries they enforced the rule that whoever persisted in differing from the church doctrine in a single article, was to be punished by death; they sanctioned the principle that a relapsed heretic, that is, one who has been convicted of differing for the second time from the doctrine of the church, was to be executed, even if he recanted. Should the infallibility of popes be proclaimed"(he was writing this before 1870),"it would self-evidently extend to the whole province of morals as well as to that of dogmas. It would be impossible to suppose that a pope had ever stood by a principle that was reprehensible from a moral point of view, that he had ever issued an immoral decision, or instituted a proceeding that contradicted Christian ethics. No Catholic might under these circumstances either dare to say or think that the institution of the Inquisition was an error, or that the laws for it given by the popes had at times been immoral. "Nevertheless," he adds, "a glance at modern literature shows that nowadays, at all events outside of Italy, no one dares any longer to defend the institution as it really was, or the laws and principles given and set up for it by the popes."

From all this action of popes, we are forced to one of two alternatives; either that the popes are not infallible, or else, being infallible, as Romanism declares, they prove the Inquisition to be right, justifiable, necessary, and to be perpetuated. For what

has been the order of the church is still its standing law.

Ecclesiastical persecution is declared in the Roman Catholic law of to-day to be a duty. Every bishop who takes the full pontifical oath has to swear that he will, to the utmost of his ability, persecute and exterminate every heretic. Persecution is also enjoined as a duty upon private persons.

Pope Urban II., in 1088, decreed, and it is embodied in the canon law of Rome, as follows: —

"Those are not to be accounted murderers or homicides who, when burning with love and zeal for their Catholic mother against excommunicated Protestants, shall happen to kill a few of them."

When the canon law was revised by a commission of cardinals under Pope Gregory XIII., in 1580, this decree was left in, and was made an article of faith. It is now *de fide* and part of the unalterable law of the church of Rome.

Pius IV., when the government of Lucca had enacted a law offering a reward of three hundred crowns and the reversal of any sentence of outlawry, or the power of transferring any such pardon, to all persons who should succeed in murdering any of the Protestant refugees who had fled from that city, described it as a "pious and praiseworthy decree, piously and wisely enacted, and that nothing could redound more to God's honor, provided it was thoroughly carried into execution."

The penalty of death for heresy was pronounced by so many popes, confirmed and repeated so many times, and carried into execution so many more, that it seems almost useless to adduce further proofs of their responsibility; but I must beg to quote a por-

tion of the Bull *in Cœna Domini*, used in the annual cursing, on the anniversary of the institution of the Lord's Supper. Pius V. and Urban VIII. ordained that it should be read on each Maunday Thursday from every Roman Catholic pulpit in Christendom. On that day, all who doubted a single article of faith, according to the maxim of canon law, as well as all who refused absolute obedience to the Pope's authority, were anathematized in language part of which is as follows: —

"Cursed, banned, in the name of God, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and in that also of the blessed St. Peter and St. Paul, shall be, firstly, all Hussites, Wickliffites, Lutherans, Zwinglians, Calvinists, Huguenots, Anabaptists, Trinitarians, Unitarians, and all and every other heretic. Secondly, all those who give any succor or aid to any heretic, comfort him, shelter him, or show him countenance in any way.

"Thirdly, all who buy, read, print, or disseminate, or favor in any way, any religious book published without the sanction of the apostolic throne.

"Fourthly, all universities, colleges, and cathedral chapters on their appealing to a Council.

"Fifthly, all who may offer any let or hindrance to expediting of money and necessaries, etc., etc., to the papal court, or who sequestrate its revenues; further, those also who lay taxes on the clergy, though they be kings or kaisers; those who meddle in ecclesiastical affairs or plans under papal jurisdiction; those who offer any resistance to the commands of the popes, his legates or nuncios. Finally, all who obey not the representatives of St. Peter as it would behoove them to obey God himself."

This notorious bull originated undoubtedly with the arrogant Boniface VIII. It was enlarged and perfected by Urban V., Julius II., Paul III., Gregory XIII., and especially by Pius V. and Urban VIII., and as late as 1864, in the States of the Church, and

in Rome especially, it was proclaimed on the appointed anniversary in every church.

We have thus proved that the Inquisition, in all respects, in its worst features, is an essential part of the Romish Church and of papal procedure, demanded by its claims, its assumed authority, the infallibility of its popes, and its standing laws. And that this conclusion is absolutely true, we now propose to prove by showing *that up to present times, the Inquisition* is a part of the machinery of the church.

It was in full operation, so far as the Pope's authority could enforce it, up to the year 1809, when it was annulled by Napoleon Bonaparte, together with all the mediæval machinery of the temporal power. But in 1814, upon the restoration of the papacy, the holy father at once applied himself to resuscitate the Inquisition. In August, 1814, a General Inquisitor was appointed, and the institution of the Inquisition constituted as the supreme judicial tribunal of the Holy Office. Its spies soon spread through the land, penetrated every family circle, and all, on the slightest cause for suspicion, were at once seized and thrown into dungeons of the sacred tribunal. The offences under its cognizance were specified, as "blasphemy, immorality, disrespectful conduct toward the church, non-participation in its festivals, neglect of its fasts, and especially abandonment of the true faith."

A general edict, on the 4th of May, 1829, set forth that all persons possessing books of an heretical character, or by writers of known heretical tendencies, whether said books were kept in their own or other persons' domiciles, should be "dealt with as those who

had fallen from the faith." We learn by the same edict that any person "who should give cause of offence by act or word, or threaten so doing, to any of the familiars, witnessess, accusers, or spies of the Inquisition," should thereby come within its jurisdiction; and the Pope directed positively all his police, gendarmes, and public employees to assist the servants of the Holy Office in securing such offenders.

To fill up the measure of horrors, Pope Pius VIII. decreed that whosoever heard a word of blame uttered against the Holy Office, the Inquisition, but still more, whosoever witnessed an offence against its judicial authority without at once denouncing, that is, reporting that which he had heard or seen, should thereby become amenable to the same penalty as though guilty of the original offence. These spies and agents of the Inquisition were exempt from the jurisdiction of the civil courts, so that if taken in the act of committing the most flagrant crime, the Grand Inquisitor could demand the person of his agent, and, under pretence of judging the case himself, at once set him at liberty by a free pardon. Remember that this was within the present century.

As punishments, the Inquisition employed, as we learn by a regulation dating May, 1856, "excommunication and confiscation, banishment, imprisonment for life, application of the lash, and secret execution in heinous cases;" and this Inquisition flourished in the Pontifical States up to 1870. While the rulers of France, Germany, and Portugal refused the application of the Pope to set up the Inquisition in their dominions, Ferdinand VII. of Spain obeyed the behest

of Rome, and in 1814 established the Holy Office in all its ancient glory. It was formally dissolved by Cortez in 1820; re-established in Spain by the reactionary party in 1826, and finally abolished in 1835.

Gregory XVI. inaugurated it in Sardinia, Modena, and Tuscany, where it remained until 1859, existing last of all in Rome itself, from which let us hope it has forever departed.

But, bear in mind that in our own time Perrone, Professor of theology at Rome, demands that the Inquisition exist to try heretics; while an excellent authority informs us that in a modified form the decrees of the Inquisition are in force in the Province of Quebec at this very hour.

To this demonstration by immediate present history, of the full indorsement of the Inquisition by the popes, must be added yet another. While these inquisitors are justly held in execration by all merciful and right-minded people, they have been canonized and extolled by the popes, and that very recently.

Von Döllinger tells us: "Only very recently, at an opening meeting of the Consistory, Pius IX. delivered a eulogy on the Inquisition, and declared it to be a beneficial and genuinely ecclesiastical institution. On the 29th of June, 1867, Pius IX. in St. Peter's Church, which was magnificently decorated for the occasion, formally canonized Pedro Arbues, one of the inquisitors of Spain, who for his fierce and cruel persecuting, in association with Torquemada, was stabbed at the altar by his exasperated and suffering victims, on the 17th of December, 1485. Pius IX. recommended all Spaniards to honor this man in

future as a pattern of Christian virtues, and now with other saints they may invoke him to pray for them."

Commenting on this shocking event, Von Döllinger says, "If I were now to give the Pope assurance of my submission to the Roman see, should I not have to give expression also to my most submissive adhesion to the eulogy on the Inquisition and to the canonizing of Dom Pedro de Arbues?" He certainly would, as all Roman Catholics must.

Could you ask any more ample proof that the Inquisition, the inquisitors, their cruelty, their bloodshed, and all their horrible deeds, are commendable in the minds of the highest dignitaries of the Roman Catholic Church? To fix the responsibility, more complete proof than this is needless; and so I pass to make clear an additional fact which is most important to our understanding of the attitude of the Romish Church. That fact is, that the church itself is responsible for the Inquisition and all its horrors. Some of its apologists have endeavored to show that not the church, but the secular power, was the executioner of heretics. This is the merest subterfuge, and is far more false than true. The secular power, when completely under the domination of the papacy, executed its behests, because it dared not do otherwise; and no human government has ever instituted any persecutions which can equal in bloodthirstiness those of the Church of Rome itself. It was the church which originated and sanctioned the Inquisition. The church acted as police and procurer of victims, and delivered these victims to the executioner. If not wielding the axe, or piling the fagots, the church compelled

others so to do, under pain of suffering in like manner. The papal church originated the Inquisition. It was not the outgrowth of the national character of the several centuries in which it mostly flourished. Here we have a bull of Pope Urban IV. in 1261, in which he emphatically warned the general of the Dominicans, the great persecuting order of the church, never to forget that the authority to persecute heresy did not necessarily reside in the order itself, but had been bestowed by the Pope and could, therefore, at any moment be withdrawn. Thus this infallible pope claimed to be the source of all the persecuting authority.

Pope Urban VIII. persuaded King Louis XIII. to attempt the destruction of Protestantism, and wrote to the king of France expressing his hope that he "would utterly uproot all the remaining heretics in the country." Goading all monarchs by direst threats to the utmost cruelties against Protestants was characteristic of all the popes. They exulted in the bloody work of their tools and ministers.

When the town of Beziers was taken by the papal troops in 1209, and one of the most revolting massacres the world ever witnessed was directed by papal legates, 7,000 victims were burned alive, 60,000 died within the city. Those who knelt to entreat mercy of the conquerors were ruthlessly butchered; and amidst the burning of houses, the horrible violation of females, the wild riot and plunder, the monks who accompanied the army gathered in the market-place to sing a hymn of thanksgiving to God. While

Europe was filled with horror at this savage victory, Innocent III., the great pope who ordered it, and his devoted clergy, rejoiced over this holocaust with exceeding joy, declaring that "the beginning of the end of heresy had dawned."

The horrible massacre of St. Bartholomew in France, in 1572, whose victims numbered not less than 70,000 persons, was an occasion for extraordinary joy on the part of Pope Gregory XIII. Immediately on receiving the news, he summoned the cardinals to proceed in solemn procession to St. Peter's to give God thanks, while the cannons of St. Angelo thundered and the streets of Rome were illumined by bonfires. A great jubilee and plenary indulgence was appointed by the holy father in his joy on receiving the head of Admiral Coligny, which had been preserved in spirits by order of the king, Charles IX., while he further rewarded his dear son with the title of "Most Pious." He also caused a medal to be struck and a painting to be executed in honor of the massacre, and he issued a bull to Charles IX., urging him "to persevere in so pious and wholesome a measure till his once most religious kingdom should be thoroughly purged of blasphemous heresies;" subsequently, he urged the Emperor Maximilian to deal with his heretical subjects as the king of France had done.

It was a direct papal command which set on foot the fearful ravages of the Roman Catholic crusaders in Bohemia. Moreover, that victims might be obtained to satisfy the bloodthirsty monsters of the Pope, Innocent VIII., in a bull, April 3, 1487, ordered

all princes and rulers to seize and deliver to the Inquisition of Spain all fugitives who should be designated to them, thus extending the arms of the Holy Office throughout the whole of Christendom, and practically outlawing all refugees. Fortunately, the princes, more humane than the Pope, refused to obey this order.

Can popes shift the responsibility of these dire massacres upon other shoulders than their own when they have forced secular princes to destroy heretics, and have ordered armies and nations "to take up arms against offenders," who, as Pope Innocent III. said of the heretics of France, were "no better than unbelievers of the East, and, beyond question, far more noxious"? By a special bull, this pope granted plenary indulgence, both for the past and the future, to all, whether knights or peasants, who should enter the field against the Albigenses, enjoined these warriors to sack and spoil all the towns and villages in the land of the unbelievers, and promised to reward barons and knights with its broad lands and fair castles.

So the popes furnished victims as well as executioners. Ay, and the church became itself the executioner. No catalogue can be made of papal crimes. Even after the restoration of Pius IX. in 1850, the horrors committed at Perugia by the papal mercenaries were as dreadful as any of the Middle Ages. No quarter was given. The mother was massacred with her unborn child; and when all resistance to the Pope on the part of the insurrection had ceased, and those among the rebels capable of

bearing arms had left the city, the slaughter of the helpless multitude left behind commenced, and the atrocities committed exceeded the worst ever perpetrated by Austrian pandours. Women and young girls were foully violated, and then impaled alive, or thrown from the house windows to be caught on bayonets, or they were transfixed with lances and so dragged through the streets. Mothers with their babes were thrown into oil casks, which were then set on fire. Yet Pope Pius IX. thought not of laying ban or interdict on the brutal leader of his troops, the Swiss Captain Smidt, but, on the contrary, appointed him, for his heroic conduct in this affair, to the rank of general of brigade! And this, remember, was only forty years ago.

I have not recited these details of horrible persecution, past and present, without a motive, which may well stir your minds to-day. This motive is not to arouse your resentment against Roman Catholic people, for many of those who thus suffered at the hands of the papacy were nominal members of the Roman Catholic Church, and multitudes now members of that church would shrink with horror at being partakers in the bloody deeds which have been instigated and carried out by their inquisitorial superiors. But my motive has been to make clear to you the great and all-important fact that Rome's despotic sway, which she would set up over this country, has always included, as a necessary part of her governmental machinery, the searches, spies, arrests, imprisonments, confiscations, tortures, burnings, of the Inquisition, and, worse than all these, and resulting from them,

the consequent suppression of the intellectual life and progress of the people.

It is for you to determine whether an institution so repugnant to all justice, so destructive to all prosperity, so fatal to all aspiration, so diabolical and contradictory to the spirit of Christ, shall have any place with you and your posterity.

PERSECUTION AND PROPERTY.

I WILL take for my text one of those remarkably condensed statements of universal truth of a most practical and comprehensive character with which the Holy Scriptures abound. It is found in 1 Tim. vi. 10: "The love of money is a root of all evil."

The pictures of the Roman Catholic Inquisition which have been drawn by a hundred historians reveal to us one of the most terrible chapters in human history. No pen nor tongue can with any degree of adequacy portray, or even suggest, the dreadful cruelties on the one hand, and the agonizing sufferings on the other, of those who carried on the Inquisition and of those who suffered under it.

They reduced cruelty and torture to a science, ordering its processes with diabolical malignity. Here are some extracts from the "Sacro Arsenale," Bologna, 1665, a handbook of the procedure of the Inquisition.

"CXXVI. Torture should begin with those most suspected, and, if they be a man and woman, is to begin with the woman, as the more timid and frail; and if all are males, *then with the youngest and feeblest.*"

"CCIV. The sons of heretics do not incur the penalties enacted against them, provided they judi-

ciously disclose to the Holy Tribunal the heresy of their parents and secure their imprisonment."

"CCXXI. A true Catholic is bound to denounce heretics, even if he have promised, pledged his faith, and sworn to them not to disclose them; such promise or oath being of no force or obligation."

"CCLXXVI. The doctors (and with good reason) hold the crime of heresy to be so atrocious, that they account heresy incurred through ignorance as worse than murder committed with treachery."

The cruelty of these and similar ordinances which Rome has never repudiated, and which she still avows, is only too obvious.

The catechism of the Council of Trent, asserting the right to punish heretics, involves the third canon of the Fourth Council of Lateran, which canon orders all secular princes to extirpate every heretic in their states; and in the event of failure to comply with this injunction, such princes are to be excommunicated, their subjects released from their oath of allegiance, and their territories to be given over to the Catholics, who are to destroy the heretics, and possess the country as their reward, besides acquiring, in virtue of their exerminating zeal, all the indulgences granted to the Crusaders in Palestine.

This is still unrepealed and unrepented; indeed, there is a similar clause in Paul IV.'s bull, "Cum Ex Apostolatus officio," of 1559, with this further touch, that heretics are "to be deprived of every consolation of humanity," all of which is expressly part and parcel of the law of the papacy to this day.

A question which has often occurred to you and to

me, and which I doubt not arose in many minds on last Sabbath, when the Inquisition was the subject of our thought, is this: What motive can account for all this horrible cruelty? What inspiration, from whatever source, could enter into a human being which would transform him into so ferocious a creature that he would become a party to cruelties like these? What motive could cause a combination of men, who by some means or other were the leaders and controllers of the world for a long period of time, for successive centuries, in the name of the gracious and gentle Saviour of mankind, to take delight in torturing to death their fellow creatures? This question had never been thought about by me so much as during the last four months. It has gained additional interest from the fact that of course the hundreds of thousands of people who were the victims of the Inquisition were absolutely hostile to it, and did all in their power to oppose it. They tried by their lives and their words to resist persecution and to enlighten their persecutors. Moreover, there was always a vast company of people who sympathized with these persecuted ones, — their relatives, their fellow citizens who knew their worth, the better minded conservative people of the time and of the church; and yet against the strongest possible opposition of these, who were generally a minority though not always so, with relentless and despotic hand, the Pope and his agents carried forward, for the space of at least eight hundred years, all the diabolical and destructive machinery of the Inquisition.

1. You might suppose that religious bigotry and zeal

could account for the Inquisition, that the hatred which men entertain toward those of another faith was the cause thereof. I seriously question this. I very much doubt whether men become so antagonistic to their fellows on account of religious hatred, because others hold to a different religion, and I much more doubt whether people who hold slightly varied shades of Christian belief, that is to say who hold in modified form the same theory and doctrine, could ever by religious bigotry become so hostile to one another as to perpetrate on their neighbors the worst of all tortures. I do not believe that religious bigotry, taking it in the large historical survey, can account for the Roman Catholic Inquisition.

2. And certainly it was no spirit of beneficence. It was not because certain in the Roman Catholic church thought that others had varied from them slightly in opinion and must be brought back to entertain the same opinion. There was no fear on the part of those who persecuted lest the slightly changed opinions of the persons whom they persecuted should issue in the destruction of their faith and the ruin of their souls.

It has been said by some who have surveyed the surface of this great problem that men were burned at the stake by Roman Catholic priests and inquisitors, in order that they might be saved from burning in hell, and therefore some who have a very strong antagonism to the doctrine of hell have said, "You may charge upon that doctrine the Inquisition, since the endeavor to save the souls of the people who were persecuted was made by their persecutors that they might not be plunged into remediless hell." But I cannot

find, as I study the history, that this is an adequate reason or cause, because very generally those who were persecuted, tortured, starved and burned, were told that they were going to hell after all that they had suffered, and that remediless torture awaited them in the future world after the church had tortured them in this. Persecution was not, therefore, intended to be a saving process.

3. Nor can you account for the Inquisition on the ground of national or tribal hatreds and feuds, for although it was sometimes true, as when the crusaders of the Pope ravaged Bohemia and France, and when the Duke of Alva scourged Holland, that a difference of nationality was in part the basis of the savagery of the persecutors, it yet remains true that oftentimes the sufferers were persecuted by their own fellow countrymen, by their own fellow townsmen, by their own kindred and relatives. So when I am asked to concede to the national hatreds of the time the occasion for the Inquisition, I confess that I do not find it so, nor do I believe that they were influential to any other than a small degree.

4. Were the persecutions of the Inquisition, then, the result of the effort of political and priestly tyrants to retain unbroken control over the people whom they ruled, whether in ecclesiastical or civil affairs? Is it not true that despotic princes, whether of the church or the state, see with alarm the rising spirit of liberty and undertake, as far as in them lies, to repress it by the destruction of those leaders who rise up and think for themselves? It is true that despots do act in this way at times; but you never knew, I think, a succes-

sion of rulers through a period of eight or ten centuries, in many lands and under many forms of government, to make such an attempt, or to find an adequate reason for the wholesale slaughter of their choicest subjects in the enlightenment of the minds of the people who were under their government. And if tyrants do try by severity to retain their rule, why is it? what is the selfish principle at the foundation? Is it that they may have a hundred or a thousand or ten thousand more obedient subjects? or is there back of all the despot's terrific onslaught on the up-risings of liberty, another motive which I am about to disclose, one which I cannot doubt is fundamental in this whole matter of the Inquisition and the religious persecutions of the Roman Catholic church. Oftentimes when the civil ruler hesitated to employ force against the people, and was willing that they should think and that they should worship according to the dictates of their consciences, the ecclesiastical despots, representatives of the Pope, insisted that these rulers should crush the rising spirit of their people under penalty of themselves being excommunicated, and of losing their wealth, their thrones, and their empires.

5. I propose to show on this occasion what I do not know to have ever been extendedly shown on any former occasion, that the moving cause of the Inquisition of the Roman Catholic church was very largely that lust of wealth, that spirit of avarice, that unbridled selfishness, which undertakes, whether in the highway robber or in the ecclesiastical robber, to plunder men of their possessions in order to enrich the plunderer. I believe I can show, not that the

other motives were wholly inoperative, but that the fundamental motive of the Romish hierarchy for all these centuries has been avarice and the lust of gain.

Now I can bring this so near to this audience that you can see that it is a living question of the present hour. What damnable spirit out of hell could entice in the city of New York on Sunday, May 8, 1892, five thousand people to pay a dollar apiece to see a bit of a mummified human body officially declared to be part of the arm of "St. Ann, Mother of the Virgin Mary and grandmother of God," unless it was the very spirit which says, "Your money or your life," whether in the massacre of Beziers or St. Bartholomew, the Exile of the Huguenots, or from the lips of the highway robber on the dark road? (Applause.)

6. "Love of money," said the inspired man, "is a root of all evil." Where would the rum traffic be if it were not for this love of money? We argue that the appetites of men are depraved, and that they will have liquor; but you find the liquor maker and vender creating the appetite everywhere in those who have it not, for love of money. Where would prostitution be but for the love of money and what it brings?

Not even the powerful natural appetites of the race could nourish the dark deeds of debauched humanity, if it were not that gold and profit are the price and product of this monstrous evil. And gambling, whether on the horse-race at our Agricultural Fair, or at Coney Island and Guttenburg, or where young men in their clubs play cards for stakes of ten or twenty cents, or the millionaires of New York for ten or twenty thousand dollars, — I say where would

gambling be if it were not for the love of money? Where would be the oppression of the poor? Where would be human slavery? Where the traffic in the bodies and souls of men? Where falsehood and lying? Where business dishonesty? Where the thousand ills that afflict mankind, if the love of money were subordinated and a more generous principle prevailed?

We saw Columbus on the West India islands enslaving the people and selling them for money, compelling forced service in the mines, and decimating the inhabitants of those fair islands of the Caribbean Sea. But Columbus was doing there only what the church was doing at home at that very time, plundering and abusing myriads of men for the purpose of acquiring their property. We saw Cortez in Mexico stretching the son of Montezuma on burning coals that he might be forced to tell where was concealed the treasure of the Aztecs; but Cortez learned to do this from the priests of Spain, who had been doing it for two hundred and fifty years.

We saw Pizarro imprisoning the Inca of Peru until the room in which the Ruler was shut up was filled with sixteen millions of treasure, then cruelly killing him and taking the ransom; and while we condemn his cruelty, we must remember that the nation of which he was a representative, under the dictates of the only religion which he knew, was doing the same with Protestants and with Roman Catholics who erred at all from the papal creed, and had been murdering thousands for gold during centuries.

When, therefore, I survey the horrors of Spanish

invasion and colonization in this country, I see the original cause of it in the dread cruelty and universal plundering of the papal power, as it ruled supreme over Italy, France, Spain, Portugal, and parts of Germany.

I. And now to proceed to some of the proofs that property was a chief purpose of persecution, that it should be the first thing on which to lay emphasis, when surveying this question in the light of the many histories and by comparing them. In all histories of the Inquisition a certain word frequently recurs to show the policy of the papal church. Laws are adjusted to regulate the meaning and definition of that word, and it is as common as the word heresy itself. That word is CONFISCATION, or the taking away from its owners of property and putting it into the treasury of the church, as a portion of the penalty for heretical opinions. This word, I say, is very frequently repeated, and wherever repeated is full of a significance which I did not formerly dream was in it.

1. I find one of the ablest historians of the Inquisition, Henry C. Lea, saying in a paragraph of great moderation, considering how large is his information: "This greed for the plunder of the wretched victims of persecution is peculiarly repulsive as exhibited by the Church, and may to some extent palliate the similar action by the State in countries where the latter was strong enough to seize and retain it. The threats of coercion, which at first were necessary to induce the temporal princes to confiscate the property of their heretical subjects, soon became superfluous, and history has few displays of man's eagerness to

profit by his fellow's misfortunes more deplorable than that of the vulture which followed in the wake of the Inquisition to batten on the ruin which it wrought."

I find him saying again: "We therefore are perfectly safe in asserting that but for the gains to be made out of fines and confiscations its work would have been much less thorough, and that it would have sunk into comparative insignificance as soon as the first frantic zeal of bigotry had exhausted itself. This zeal might have lasted for a generation, to be followed by a period of comparative inaction, until a fresh onslaught would have been excited by the recrudescence of heresy. By confiscation the heretics were forced to furnish the means for their own destruction. Avarice joined hands with fanaticism, and between them they supplied motive power for a hundred years of fierce, unremitting, unrelenting persecution, which in the end accomplished its main purpose." That is in the Inquisition of the Middle Ages, which closed somewhere about the middle of the fourteenth century.

2. The most thrifty people were generally the persecuted people. This was not always so, for I do not pretend to give avarice as a reason which covers every specific case. The Waldenses were not rich, the Albigenses were. But in general the people who think for themselves have the mental force which makes them more industrious than others and more prosperous. It therefore follows that independent thought and true piety are generally associated with worldly prosperity, and when you come to examine

the history of the persecutions of Papal Rome, whether personal or general, you find that it was the best people who were the objects of her assault. The Huguenots of France, about whom you have so often heard, are declared in the Schaff-Herzog Encyclopædia, the latest and best of its kind, to have been the most industrious and intelligent people in France. From four hundred thousand to a million French Huguenots, no one knows exactly their numbers, who were exiled from France by the revocation of the edict of protection known as the Edict of Nantes, went to all the lands of the world as most welcome immigrants. They were kindly and gladly received in Holland, Germany, and England, and promised that they should have from eight to twelve years' residence without taxation and that the burdens of citizenship should be laid upon them very lightly, on account of their superior character and capacity, because the Huguenot of France was the best citizen that France had. All the nations were glad to take them in, and to give them a place and a home, not only for humanity's sake, but for the riches which they brought, the intelligence which they distributed in society, and the service which they rendered as citizens. These people were only representatives of the myriads who were persecuted. The Jews of Spain, who had turned to Christianity in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, are said by the historians to have been the flower of Spain. They had intermarried with the nobility, they were people of large intelligence and extraordinary business capacity, the foremost people of the Peninsula. They had so

much legal knowledge, so many of them were in high places, that when the Inquisition assailed them with its terrors, they were able to make resistance in many ways, paying out large sums of money for legal proceedings on the part of their famous lawyers who thus attempted to withstand the tide of persecution, but all in vain. They offered at one time to Ferdinand and Isabella, six hundred thousand crowns of gold if the monarchs would save them from the exile which one horrible edict had put upon them. So vast was their wealth that they may be said to have been the treasurers of Spain. But when they offered this great sum of money to be relieved from persecution, the persecutors with Torquemada at their head, knowing full well that they could get more by continuing to persecute, refused it; and the much lauded Ferdinand and Isabella, at the very time when Columbus discovered San Salvador, in that very year, 1492, were in league with the church confiscating uncounted millions of the property of their best subjects and inflicting a blow upon Spain from which she has not recovered to this day.

3. I ought to pause here, perhaps, to raise the inquiry why it was that so many of these persons who were seized for heresy had no just form of trial whatever. I have raised that question to myself more than once. Why was every principle of ordinary legal procedure violated, and every principle of justice set at naught, in dealing with them? If they were guilty, it could have been found out, if those who persecuted desired to find it out by honest methods. But you find a singular lack in all the proc-

esses of the Inquisition of anything which savored of justice. Inquisitors were utterly regardless of justice. Why? Because, as I have learned, they had resolved to plunder their victims, they cared not whether they were heretics or not, whether they were innocent or guilty, any more than the highway robber cares whether the victim whom he grasps, plunders, and murders, is good or bad, so he gets his gold.

If these victims had been guilty of all that was charged against them, they would have been innocent of any wrong doing. If every one of all the charges had been true, they could have lived in this city among our most respected citizens. Nothing evil could truly be said against them. In what did the crime of heresy consist? What were the charges which were made against these members of society and the church that sent them to their death, and gave their property to the church and state? I cannot detail all the charges called, in general, heresy,—but I have most of them here before me as they were formulated by the chief inquisitor of Spain under papal direction. Look, my friends, and see what the infallible intelligence of the papal church has declared to be crimes worthy of the most dreadful sufferings which can be inflicted! I take them from a general list which I hold in my hand. "If they know or have heard, that any one has said, defended, or believed that the sect of Luther or his followers is good, or that he has believed and approved any of its condemned propositions: to wit:—

That it is not necessary to confess sins to the priest, since it is sufficient to confess them before God;

That neither pope nor priests have power to absolve from sins;

That the true body of our Lord Jesus Christ is not in the consecrated host;

That we ought not to pray to saints, nor ought there to be images in the churches;

That there is no purgatory, nor any necessity to pray for the deceased;

That any one, although not a priest, may hear another in confession, and give him the communion under the two kinds of bread and wine;

That the pope has no power to grant indulgences and pardons;

That clerks, friars, and nuns may marry;

That there ought not to be friars, nuns, nor monasteries;

That God did not institute the regular religious orders;

That the state of marriage is more perfect than that of unmarried clerks and friars;

That it is not a sin to eat flesh on Fridays, in Lent, and on other days of abstinence;

If they know, *or have heard say*, that any one has held, believed, or defended various other opinions of Luther and his followers, or that any one has left the kingdom to be a Lutheran in other countries."

Can you see any crime in these things? can you see damage in them? can you see danger in them? And yet to assent to any one of these truths involved the loss of all one's goods, his liberty, his life, and the infamy as well as the plunder of his children. Now can you account, in your reason, for so fearful

consequences coming from such innocent opinions without believing that plunder was the purpose of persecution? Do you suppose that the persecutors thought that these men were dangerous or injurious to society? I do not believe that they did. Their minds were made up on another basis.

4. The church profited by all these persecutions. In some cases the property of the heretic was divided into three parts: the church took one part, the inquisitors a second part, and the third part was given to the treasury of the country in which the heretic lived. In other cases it was divided into two parts, of which the church took one part, and the inquisitors the other. And in other cases it was left as a unit, and the church took it all.

Besides, this is in perfect harmony with the known, the well-known, avarice of Rome, to which I have already alluded. I am going to ask and answer the question, at a later date, why purgatory was invented, why indulgences, why masses, why relics? I cannot do that to-day; but when I say that Rome's confiscations were entirely in harmony with all her policy, I state the simple truth. (Applause.) I give the reason for her course and her conduct. The Inquisition is only a small part of the whole system by which a multitude of priests live by plundering their fellows, and live in luxury while their victims live in poverty.

II. But I now enter upon the details of the method of the Inquisition in confiscating the property of its victims. There was great prominence given in the minds of all persecutors, to this matter of property, as

you will see by this fact first of all, that the popes themselves took the initiative, and ordered the confiscation of the goods of heretics.

1. You find that Pope Innocent III., who is in such honor in the Roman Catholic church as one of the greatest of their popes, takes the following attitude. He says, "In the lands subject to our temporal jurisdiction we order the property of heretics to be confiscated; in other lands we command this to be done by the temporal princes and powers, who, if they show themselves negligent therein, shall be compelled to do it by ecclesiastical censures. Nor shall the property of heretics who withdraw from heresy revert to them, unless some one pleases to take pity on them. For as, according to the legal sanctions, in addition to capital punishment, the property of those guilty of treason is confiscated, and life simply is allowed to their children through mercy alone, so much the more should those who wander from the faith and offend the Son of God be cut off from Christ and be despoiled of their temporal goods, since it is a far greater crime to assail spiritual than temporal majesty."

You find also that in a bull of Pope Innocent IV. he directs the rulers of Lombardy to confiscate without fail the property of all who were excommunicated as heretics, or receivers, defenders, or assistants of heretics. Pius IX., in his encyclical of 1864 which I have read in your hearing, commends the action of all his predecessors, says there is no fault to find with it or them: therefore he too, and all those who trust in him, make themselves in some degree responsible for these same opinions.

Sometimes the Protestants were banished from the lands in which they lived and those lands were given to Roman Catholics, as in the case of the diocese of Salzburg at the close of the Thirty Years' War. Twenty-two thousand people were forced to leave their homes, solely because they loved the truth and liberty. Their Roman Catholic neighbors were told not to help them by buying their lands or their houses, for they should have them without purchase, and so they did, while these poor people hastened to find a more merciful government; and began again, in utmost poverty, a new race for life, but not until their money and their children as their houses and lands had been ruthlessly taken from them. In the case of the Jewish converts in Spain, they were given from March, 1492, to the last day of July, about four months, to forsake all they had, and whoever assisted them in any way was considered equally guilty with them of the crime of heresy. This was evidently done in order that the government might seize upon their property and enrich itself by their plunder and spoliation. We have a most pathetic record of how these Jews pleaded for a little time that they might by any means turn their lands into money and have somewhat to live upon as they went away. All mercy was denied them. They hastened to the seaports, meeting incredible hardships. Crowded into vessels, without even food enough to eat, they launched on the Mediterranean, many of them starving, and being thrown overboard as they voyaged, in the hope of finding some government which would show them a humanity which the papal church has never shown.

2. The confiscations were sure, relentless, and avaricious. A careful inventory was made of the goods of every man whom they arrested. Even the debts which were owing him were taken into the account, and these were made also the property of the church. The Inquisition was the real confiscator. But to go still farther, and to show how bent the church was on robbery, observe that when suspicion fell upon a man and he was arrested, the Inquisitors and their officers did not wait for his conviction, but instantly upon his arrest took all his goods, everything which he had, and turned his family out of doors utterly despoiled. Among the horrors of the Inquisition which have never been dwelt upon, so terrible were its other deeds, is this, that just as soon as the owner, the father of the family and the owner of property, was arrested, his family had no place to lay their heads. Whoever took them into his house, or gave them food, or sheltered or clothed them, was himself considered an object of suspicion. His property was seized, his goods were forfeited. Ay, friends, if the husband of your daughter had been seized in the night, not knowing his accuser or his crime, and hurried off to the dungeons of the Inquisition in the darkness, and she at midnight had come to you because the inquisitors had seized her house, — if she had come with her baby in her arms, and her little ones crying at her knees, and you had taken her into your house, and sheltered her, you would have been in the prisons of the Inquisition before the next night, and all your property, and all that of any who showed you mercy, would have been taken from you. Families

of suspected heretics, to every degree of kinship, who even showed them sympathy or pity, were thus robbed of their possessions. I ask you now, not why the church was inhuman, but I ask you why it was that in every case the first thing which they did after seizing the person of a man was to confiscate all that he had. We gaze on the Vatican and its treasures of art to-day. For hours and days I have wandered through its splendid halls, or have stood under the dome of St. Peter's and admired its splendor; but these treasures of the papacy and all its magnificence are the treasures of robbery, taken from infancy and from age through centuries of oppression by the foulest and most monstrous system of injustice that this world has ever seen. (Applause.)

3. With these gains in view the Inquisitors bribed people to present testimony against those whom they would. I was telling you not very long ago of Dom Pedro de Arbues who was cannonized as a saint by Pius IX. only a few years ago. It was common and current talk in Spain that this inquisitor paid liberally for testimony against heretics, and there is every reason to believe that this was a common practice of Inquisitors. Suppose you find yourself to-day in a state of comparative prosperity, and there is a bribe offered to any man who will charge you with expressing any of these opinions condemned by the church. There are plenty of people who would accept the bribe. One goes to the inquisitor and says, "I have heard this man say he did not believe that the body and blood of Christ were in the mass." That is enough. A reward is given to this

person out of your substance; the rest, including your life, goes to the church. And with such bribes the wonder is not that many were betrayed, but that many more were not. My friends, there is honor in humanity still, and under fearful temptations, men have proved that there was good in them. They have often kept the honor which priests have tried to destroy. The greatest debaucher of humanity that this world ever saw, in my opinion, is this same Roman Catholic hierarchy. (Applause.)

4. Debtors were tempted to discharge their debts by accusing those to whom they owed money. A spendthrift who had taken ten or fifteen thousand dollars of your money and wasted it, who was pressed by you for payment, might denounce you to the Inquisition, and all that you possessed would be taken from you. You would never know your accuser. Sometimes you may have wondered why it was that the most sacred relations of life were not proof against the Inquisition, but listen to this: Wives were told again and again that their right of dowry depended on their fidelity to the church, and if they married a man knowing that he entertained any heretical opinions, or if after they found out that he entertained heretical opinions they lived with him more than forty days, — if they did not denounce and betray him to the Inquisitors, they lost their right of dowry, and so they were stripped of all their property too, however good Catholics they were. A woman who may have heard her husband say that he did not think it was necessary to venerate the relic of St. Ann, or any other miserable old bone

declared sacred by lying priests, may have denounced him to the Inquisition solely that she in her fear might have something to live upon when he was gone, rather than to wait until others denounced him and her right of dowry and all beside went into the general treasury of the church.

In many cases where commutations were offered in money by accused persons they were accepted, and in some cases a regular business sprang up of men who, being told that they were likely to be denounced, went to the inquisitors and gave a portion of their property to save themselves from more terrible consequences.

5. In the case of the dead, have you not wondered why it was that oftentimes the priests took up the ashes of the dead and showed indignity to them? Let me tell you why it was done in many cases. If a man died supposed to be in communion with the church, and it was afterwards believed that he was a heretic through any slander whatever, no matter how long after his death, all the property of which he died possessed, in whose hands soever it was found, might be seized. You may have taken the last sacraments of the church, and died a good Roman Catholic so far as anybody knew. Forty years, fifty years, a hundred years after, it might be said that you were a heretic. Then you would be tried, although a hundred years dead. Your property would be traced, all your heirs and their heirs would be found, and the last penny which they had would be taken by the Roman Catholic church. There was no limit to the years which might intervene between death and such

a trial, and the result was that in numberless cases people who supposed themselves secure in their possessions were deprived of them without any process of law but the processes of the Inquisition, on the ground that such property was once a heretic's.

Moreover, it was a principle of papal law that no heretic could give a legal title to anything that he sold. You might have bought of me twenty years ago a piece of property, and I might have conveyed it to you in due legal form. At the expiration of twenty years, some one might accuse me of having been a heretic at the time of sale. If so, I could not transfer you that property legally; then it was taken from you and no restitution made.

Was there ever a more devilishly ingenious system of robbery since the world began? I do not believe that ever any Hindu potentate under Asiatic skies had so much satanic ingenuity in his mode of taxing and plundering his people as this discloses. And yet this is the holy Roman Catholic infallible church. (Applause.) And this is the master of more people in Worcester to-day than you and I are willing to admit, not only Roman Catholics but Protestants. (Applause.) This is the history that our timid people are indorsing. This is the papacy for which they are building parochial schools. I am not charging the Roman Catholic people, God knows, with this villany. They are the ones who have suffered, as well as other protesting Christians. They are the ones who have been plundered for over a thousand years and are being plundered to-day. They are the ones that were cheated and robbed of thousands of dollars

in New York last Sunday for a sight of a bit of bone. They are the ones whose priests go up and down the church aisles in this city and compel them to give whether they want to or not. I plead for them. I plead for a manly Protestantism to stand up for the Roman Catholics who are being trampled down. Help them, men of sense and humanity! (Applause.)

IV. But I must hasten to a close. What were the consequences of this system of papal plunder? Commerce and industry were ruined, business of all sorts was prostrated. I read from one of the ablest historians of our time, from whom I have already quoted: "In addition to the misery inflicted by these wholesale confiscations on the thousands of innocent and helpless women and children thus stripped of everything, it would be almost impossible to exaggerate the evil which they entailed upon all classes in the business of daily life. All safeguards were withdrawn from every transaction. No creditor or purchaser could be sure of the orthodoxy of him with whom he was dealing; and, even more than the principle that ownership was forfeited as soon as heresy had been committed by the living, the practice of proceeding against the memory of the dead after an interval virtually unlimited, rendered it impossible for any man to feel secure in the possession of property, whether it had descended in his family for generations, or had been acquired within an ordinary lifetime. Though some legists held that proceedings against the deceased had to be commenced within five years after death, others asserted that there was no limit, and the practice of the Inquisition shows that

the latter opinion was followed. The prescription of forty years' possession by good Catholics was further limited by the conditions, that they must at no time have had a knowledge that the former owner was a heretic, and, moreover, he must have died with an unsullied reputation for orthodoxy, — both points which might cast a grave doubt on titles."

1. As I said, commerce and industry were prostrated. No more perfect system could be devised for ruining a country than the system of the Inquisition, not merely for the blood it spilled, not merely for the dungeons it filled, not merely for the children that it orphaned, and the terror which depopulated provinces, but for the plunder of the possessions of the people which became at once the property of the church and of the state.

You have sometimes raised the question why it is that Spain and Portugal and Italy are so prostrate, — the South American republics, Mexico and Central America, and Quebec also, — why they are so poor and bankrupt. Their people have natural intelligence, they work very hard, they appreciate life as other people do. By what process were they ruined? I am showing you how Rome ruins all prosperity: how she ruined it in all these lands you can see for yourself in the light of to-day.

And now, within the last fifteen years, again and again within the last forty, we are told that the Inquisition would be a good thing for America. Roman Catholic publishers and authors in New England publish the work of LeMaistre, in which he states that it is a very desirable institution to plant in every

country, and they distinctly indorse this opinion; and wherever Romanism is, as I showed on last Sabbath, there the Inquisition is set up.

2. I want a word with our men of property. The rich men who escaped from Rome's avarice in former times, escaped by paying very liberally into her treasury and by becoming associate persecutors of others. The rich men of this country are all objects of priestly covetousness, and the wealth of this country they would be glad to have as they had the wealth of Mexico thirty years ago, holding a full third if not half of all property in their own hands. Men who have money cannot spend their wealth better than by resisting the inroads of this power. If you expect your children to keep what you leave them, make it impossible for Romanism to rule this nation.

3. A word with the prosperous citizens of the middle class. Why is it that Rome has no middle class in any land where she has full sway? Because the middle class are really the people who have the wealth of the country, they are its industrious, intelligent, prosperous workers. There is no middle class in Mexico nor Central America, and there are none in Italy. There was none in Spain, — there is none now. The very rich are there and the very poor. What is the destruction of the middle class?

I might answer by asking what is the source of its prosperity?

Education, intelligence, protected industry, honor, truth, pure religion, these are the allies of the people, these create the middle class. I appeal to the middle class of America. I ask you to notice that the Ro-

manism which our papers said last Monday morning was to control half of our population in 1930, is the agency which blots out the middle class. There is no opportunity for you to go up in fortune and become the millionaires; you have got to go down and be the slaves when Rome comes into power. Are you ready to do it? Putting on her screws wherever she can, as in the case of the Knights of Labor some years ago, when they were numerous and powerful, Rome endeavors to squeeze out the life-blood of a nation's wealth and to turn it to gold in her treasury, while she turns and turns again the omnipresent enginery which a little while ago was red hot persecution, and in a little while would be again, if she had her way unhindered.

The boycott is a Roman Catholic institution. There are business men on our streets to-day who are afraid of it and have told me so. They hold their trade and their money by their silence and acquiescence to Romish oppression and threats. It is only the shadow of the Inquisition stalking by, and threatening to seize the heretic's property if he does not bow submissively to the church.

All that we have said to-day will be made much clearer on next Sunday, when I put over against it a background of still larger proof.

Thus I have given you some of the principles which have forced the submission of men to the Papacy and have continued the existence of the Roman Catholic church. Some of the most evil things in this world have had the longest life. Slavery has endured for centuries because those who enslave men think that

they make wealth by it. Other curses of our own and former times have seemed to almost outlast the race which they are ruining, although we know how exceedingly evil they are. Do not infer because the Roman Catholic church is old and still exists, that therefore it is good or that God favors it. The devil lives, and hosts of people follow him still in defiance of the good God. But let us believe that however long wrong endures, however hoary robbery grows, however high the treasure of plunderers is piled, however blasphemy attempts to dethrone God, the avenger who sits in the Heavens enthroned will laugh at their presumption, for He knows that their calamity and overthrow draweth nigh. (Great Applause.)

OUR SPECIAL REQUEST.

PLEASE send us the **names and post-office addresses** of

Five or more Protestants

who believe in our Common Schools, especially members of Patriotic Orders; and

Five or more Roman Catholics

to whom we may send suitable matter concerning our Public Schools.

That you may see what our work is, we make

OUR SPECIAL OFFERS

1. For **three cents in stamps** we will mail you

"The Public Schools" and "The Pope in Politics,"

two thirty-two-page booklets containing addresses delivered by Father McGlynn to immense audiences of Roman Catholics.

2. For **a silver dime and six cents in stamps** we will mail the above and two pamphlets of eighty and thirty-two pages that every person in the United States should read, viz.:

"The Two Sides of the School Question,"

by CARDINAL GIBBONS and BISHOP KEANE on the one side, and Hon. JOHN JAY and EDWIN D. MEAD on the other.

And **"The Parochial School,"** by an IRISH CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

3. Patriotic Addresses. For a one dollar bill we will mail our twelve addresses and one copy of "*Romanism and the Republic*," or "*Romanism and the Reformation*," or 100 of our *Four-Page Leaflets*.

THE ENVELOPE SERIES. Our Quarterly.

20 cents a Year.

4. To every subscriber we will send one copy each of "*The Public Schools*," "*The Pope in Politics*," "*The Future of Romanism*," and samples of our *Four-Page Leaflets;* and subscribers can purchase either "*Romanism and the Republic*" or "*Romanism and the Reformation*," in cloth, for 60 cents, or in paper, for 35 cents, or our *Leaflets* for 50 cents a hundred.

ARNOLD PUBLISHING ASSOCIATION,

BOSTON, MASS.

☞ **CASH** should accompany all orders. Send stamps only when unavoidable. Small sums carefully wrapped come safely in silver dimes.

PAPAL GREED OF WEALTH.

I RESUME the general subject where I left it on last Sunday, taking the same text, with an additional one; viz., 1 Timothy, 6th chapter, 10th verse: "The love of money is a root of all evil;" adding to it this from the lesson which I read in Acts, the 8th chapter, from the 18th to the 21st verses: "And when Simon saw that through laying on of the apostles' hands the Holy Ghost was given, he offered them money, saying, Give me also this power, that on whomsoever I lay hands, he may receive the Holy Ghost. But Peter said unto him, Thy money perish with thee, because thou hast thought that the gift of God may be purchased with money. Thou hast neither part nor lot in this matter; for thy heart is not right in the sight of God."

The use of money in several ways recorded in Bible history is clearly subject to most severe censure. Gehazi, the servant of Elisha, taking money for the service which his master had done Naaman, gets the gold by falsehood, and the leprosy with it as a mark of God's displeasure. Judas Iscariot, because he was a thief, sold his Lord, the incarnate righteousness, for thirty pieces of silver, and became forever infamous. Simon the magician, proposing to buy

spiritual power, represents the spirit of all who deem that the gifts of God can be purchased with money. These incidents indicate, as do a thousand passages of Holy Writ, how utterly inconsistent it is with the spirit of Christ either to passionately love money, or to barter for it, or pretend to barter for it, spiritual good. If the Holy Scriptures have set their seal on any one thing so markedly that we cannot doubt their meaning, they have sealed this as a truth forever, that avarice and greed, selfishness and a grasping spirit, are totally inconsistent with true religion.

On the previous occasion, at such length that I trust the proofs were adequate, I showed to this audience that a moving cause of the Inquisition of the Roman Catholic Church has been its greed of gold. Those of you who heard the facts and arguments were satisfied that they revealed the true spirit of Romanism; but I was the more sure that it was true, because, behind all then said, I had in mind a clear historical survey of the entire policy, spirit, and intent of the Roman Catholic hierarchy for the last thousand years, and that vision reveals this hierarchy as bartering for money everything of which they declare themselves possessed, and showing, not merely in the Inquisition, but in every day's work, in every year's life, and in every century's career, that greed of money is a paramount consideration with its leading spirits and directors. This let me prove to you on the present occasion.

You will not suppose that I deny that a great many of the priests of the Roman Catholic Church are men of noble generosity, — but they do not control that

church. I am talking not about individual Roman Catholics, but about the entire policy of the church, when I cite it before the bar of Christianity as branded with a covetousness and lust of gold which is wholly inconsistent with the Christian spirit. In order to demonstrate this, I propose to name to you a few of the articles which Rome offers for money. On so sordid a theme I cannot suppose that I shall be able to speak with any very great eloquence. If I should recite to you in detail the articles which are for sale in a retail store, you, as merchants, might be commercially interested, but in general you would hardly expect to find the recital of such a catalogue thrillingly interesting. However, I think I can interest you, even in the details of the Romish shop; for the Italians call the Roman Catholic Church a shop, because they have so much on sale, and the French have a proverb that Romanism is the "religion of money."

I. I propose first to speak very briefly, reserving more for a later time, of the obvious *wealth of the church*, naming a few out of the multitude of facts.

1. Dr. Edward McGlynn says that the present Pope is worth a hundred million dollars. Dr. McGlynn lived nine years in Rome, and is a very intelligent man. I am not inquiring where the Pope obtained this wealth. I shall inquire later. Is not this a pretty good sum for the so-called vicar of Christ, the representative of Peter the fisherman, to have by him? Pope John XXII. was the son of a cobbler. He was not in office for a long period, and his pontificate was during the great schism, when the

revenues of the church were much smaller than usual; but he managed, in the period of his official life, to get so much, that at his death he left eighteen millions of ducats, and valuables to the amount of seventeen millions more. He had no ancestral wealth.

2. The Jesuits, the dominant society in the Roman Catholic Church, are bound by a vow of poverty; but when in 1772 the order was abolished by the decree of the Pope, their property amounted to two hundred millions of dollars. They had been in existence about two centuries and a half. In the state of Paraguay the Jesuits set up a patriarchal government about the year 1610, and carried it on for a century and a half. The people lived in mud hovels, the Jesuits in palaces. The people got enough to barely sustain nature, the Jesuits took the rest. And when they were abolished, in that little state the one mission of San Ignacio Mini was possessed of twenty-seven million dollars, and there were thirty such missions in Paraguay. Garneau, a Roman Catholic Canadian historian, says that the Jesuits are trying to make a Paraguay of Canada.

3. In Canada the order of the Sulpicians is said to be richer than the bank of Montreal, which is one of the great financial institutions of North America. The largest property holder in Montreal, with one exception, is the church. The endowments, tithes, dues, and so forth of the Roman Catholic Church in Canada were estimated fifteen years ago at a capital value of fifty millions of dollars. In the province of Quebec, property of the church otherwise taxable,

now exempt, is estimated at a hundred million dollars.

4. There have been times in the history of England when the revenue of the Pope from England was greater than the revenue of the king. That was one thing which caused the quarrel between the Pope and Henry VIII. Henry VIII. wanted the revenues for himself. You know the Papists are always affirming that Henry VIII. was a desperately bad character, who broke with the papacy because he wanted to divorce his wife and marry another, and they assume great virtue to the Pope as denying the divorce. But the truth is, the papal legate came to England with the permission for divorce in his pocket, which the Pope was willing to give for a consideration; but Henry would not pay the consideration, and took the matter into his own hands, declaring his independence of Italian control.

Where the church is rich, as I have often said, the people are poor. There is a current proverb in Mexico, that all the small change of the state goes into the open door of the church. I need not address myself to the task of proving the poverty of the people of those countries where the church is powerful. For later I shall show that in the matter of real estate, the Roman Catholic Church has seized and held so much, that almost every nation in the world has been compelled to confiscate her property for the sake of the people. What I have already said is merely preliminary to a further question, which is this: —

II. By what means did the church gain this wealth?

How did the papal government come to be so rich? How did it become a "shop" to the Italians, and a "silver religion" to the French? I answer, by what it sold. But some one may object, "It is harsh to affirm that the church has made sale of sundry spiritual privileges, offices, relics, and the like; say, rather, that the people gave these benefits to the church in gratitude for what the church gave to them." But the money has been forced from the people by threatening, bargaining, and deception. It has not been a free-will offering. The Roman Catholic Church (though it did not deliver the goods) has sold salvation to millions of people for centuries of time, and does so to-day. In confirmation of this let me speak somewhat in detail of the facts.

I. There is scarcely anything related to religion of which a Roman Catholic becomes possessed without paying something.

1. Beginning with infancy, baptism is conferred at a price. I do not know what the fees are in all parts of the world, but I have here what are called the "Faculties of a priest," really a license, or certificate, to perform the functions of a priest, in Ottawa, Canada, in which the fee for baptism is set at one dollar; and it is directed that for this and other services he shall send what fees he collects regularly to the bishop, if he expects to retain what are called "these faculties." In a neighboring town, a man tells me he paid five dollars for his child's baptism, and was told that ten would be more acceptable.

2. After his baptism, as the Roman Catholic grows up, the thing which is sold to him oftenest is the

mass or masses. What are these? In brief, they say that the consecrated wafer becomes the body, blood, soul, and divinity of Jesus Christ, and this they sell for a price. When a Roman Catholic dies, his friends are told that he has gone to Purgatory, a place of suffering. The question of how to get him out is a question which the priest answers. It is by having some priest manufacture God in the mass many times, and offer the same as a sacrifice. In proportion to the amount of money paid is the number of masses said. Christina, Queen of Spain, recently left enough for five thousand masses for herself, and five thousand for her husband. Thus rich people have a good deal better chance than poor people to get out of Purgatory.

In the Assembly of Florence in 1787, a Roman Catholic divine alleged that the number of privileged altars and masses in the diocese of Florence empowered to release one soul from Purgatory at each celebration, was so large, apart from the vast number of plenary indulgences, as to exceed the ratio of deaths each day, while the same proportion held good throughout the whole Catholic world. Therefore, there must be a surplus of masses. Purgatory must be empty, and the indulgences are a long way in advance of any possible demand on its space. And yet, the priests continually tell their people that Purgatory is full, and getting out is very uncertain. Moreover, a high mass costs variously, sometimes ten, sometimes twenty-five dollars; a low mass cost in Canada, the last I knew, a dollar. So many of these masses are sold for souls in Purgatory, that the

priests in Canada and the United States cannot say them all, for generally a priest is permitted to celebrate only one mass in a day. So the masses for which these Canadian and American priests get a dollar, they send to the poor priests on the Continent of Europe, who agree to say them for twenty-five cents, while these home priests keep the other seventy-five cents, which is a very fair commission. (Laughter.) In 1889 the poorer class of priests in Rome made a protest, very like a "strike," because the price of a mass was reduced from twenty to sixteen cents. They appealed to the people to help them in their fight for the other four cents, and the people laughed, which was a very proper thing to do. It seems very much like selling Christ, does it not, to say with the priest, "I now make Christ for your friend in Purgatory for one dollar, or for twenty-five dollars, or for twenty-five cents, as the case may be? I offer him up — that is, I eat him up, and that soul in Purgatory is helped on the way out." Judas Iscariot was reverent when he sold Christ compared with these. (Applause.)

3. Closely related to the masses are what are known as indulgences. These are in brief, a remission of the temporal and Purgatorial penalties of sin. Indulgences do not promise, generally, to save people from final perdition if they are persistently bad, though indulgence sellers have repeatedly promised this; but all along the road after death, indulgences are supposed to be very helpful. This whole matter of indulgences is very fully discussed in a most extraordinary pamphlet which I hold in my

hand, written by the very eminent historian, Henry C. Lea. It is entitled, "Indulgences in Spain," and is, as are all of Mr. Lea's studies, a most careful citation of original documents and undeniable authorities. Here we learn that indulgences were frequently sold on the credit system; but they did not help the buyer unless he intended to pay. If a person gets an indulgence by misrepresenting the amount of property which he has, if he is rich, and ought to pay more, and says he is not rich, and pays less, the indulgence is not good for anything. This is a shrewd way of getting a high price for spiritual goods. We find Pope Boniface IX. selling indulgences, and then withdrawing them and selling them over again, which is a somewhat singular way to speculate. Pius VII., as late as 1778, sold these indulgences in Spain, and to this very day they are freely sold there. The opponent of Martin Luther, Hieronymus Emser, admits that priests and monks were "greedy and shameless in their sale of indulgences," which is perfectly obvious to everybody. The profits of these sales were enormous. Henry IV. of Castile received in four years, as profit on the indulgences sold in his kingdom, one hundred million dollars. In 1519 Leo X., trafficking with the Spanish king, agreed to take twenty-four thousand ducats a year as his share of the profits of sales in that realm. Charles V. had a sharp conflict with Popes Leo and Adrian as to the price of a Bull of Indulgence which he desired them to issue for his dominions. They wanted two hundred thousand ducats a year, which he said he would not pay, and finally they compromised on a smaller sum, and issued the Bull.

I might read from the reports of the ambassadors of Venice at the Spanish court of the enormous revenues annually received for the sale of indulgences, sometimes as high as six hundred thousand ducats a year, which was divided between the church and state. Philip II. of Spain, who received as a part of his income the wealth of this Western Continent, obtained about as much money for the sale of indulgences to his people as from taxes and the discovery of gold in the New World. The traffic in indulgences was thoroughly organized, its officers consisting of delegates, commissioners, receivers, treasurers, preachers, and other officials. The preachers, who were to persuade the people to take indulgences, were paid by a commission on their sales. They were selected for their ability, and were compelled to do their utmost to sell, for if the preacher failed to go to a village where he might have gone, he was fined thirty ducats; and if a pastor was remiss in inviting these pardoners, as they were called, to come to his diocese, he was excommunicated. Merchants and bankers made advances on indulgences which were to be sold, and were in the hands of the government, precisely as financiers now make advances on bonds as collateral. The territory over which these preachers were sent was divided into circuits. When a bull had been sold it could not be taken back, though the buyer might wish to return it; and if a seller took it back, he was fined thirty ducats for so doing. When the travelling salesmen came to a town to preach about indulgences, and to urge the people to buy them, all business was sus-

pended. This suspension was enforced, though a great hardship. Everybody was compelled to go and hear, and every effort was made to compel them to buy. If anybody failed to leave his work and go and listen to the preacher who solicited him to buy indulgences to get his friends out of Purgatory, or to save himself from Purgatory, he was excommunicated.

These bulls were so valuable as property that great pains were taken to keep from counterfeiting them, as in the case of bank-notes. They were made in the monasteries, and very carefully guarded. Among the abuses in connection with their sale, we have the fact that the people were often compelled to take them for fear of the Inquisition, the confessors making it necessary for them to buy, with the alternative of being denounced to the inquisitors. Great and sore poverty came upon the people as a result, and when, because too poor to pay cash, the people were compelled to buy on credit, the most pitiless rigor was exercised in enforcing payment from them. A whole community would be put under an interdict; that is, all excommunicated, if there were people in it who had bought indulgences and had not paid, or could not pay. The property of the officers of the counties, personal and public, was seized from them if they did not put forth their utmost efforts to make debtors who had bought indulgences pay the debt. Intermitted for a time, in 1720 the whole machinery was restored. Again, in 1802, the most active efforts were made to enforce it. The business was renewed by Pius IX.,

the last Pope before the present one, who announced a complete exemption from the pains of Purgatory for people who would take these indulgences. Repeated bulls for the same soul were advised by Pius IX., so that they might be sure to be effective. Pius IX. granted a bull for this traffic to go on from 1878 to 1890, and stipulated the money price for this concession. In 1859 the revenue was estimated in Spain at three million pesetas. The receipts fell off in 1874. The present price of an indulgence for the poor is fifteen cents; the same for the dead. For the higher classes ninety cents is charged, and for retaining unlawful gains, twenty-three cents. And from these the gross annual revenue for the living and the dead is about three and a half million pesetas, the cost in Spain to-day of bulls of indulgence, which are sold there now under the sanction of the Roman Catholic Church.

But pardon me if I now leave this interesting subject, for if I spend as much time as this on each of their wares, I shall never finish.

4. Another way which they have of insuring salvation is by jubilees. The first jubilee was appointed by the Pope in 1340, and they have kept them up for revenue ever since. The jubilee was originally intended to occur at the expiration of each one hundred years, but the first jubilee brought the church so much money that they reduced the time to fifty, then to thirty-three, and then to twenty-five years, and having had a jubilee in 1851 they had another in 1857, an interval of only six years. At the first jubilee a million and a quarter pilgrims went to

Rome. For what did they go? Because at that time the Pope sent word to all the world that no indulgences would be granted to people unless they came to Rome to get them, and all churches which had special power, under the church law, to sell indulgences were denied that privilege during the year of jubilee. At that jubilee, in the shrines of St. Peter and St. Paul, there were deposited, says Cardinal Capitan, fifty thousand gold florins in coppers, obviously the gifts of the poor. From this you may judge what was given by the rich. Everybody who lived in the vicinity of Rome was expected to stay in the city thirty days, those who came from a distance to stay fifteen days, and of course all that they spent in the city was for the enriching of the papal power. Persons who could not go to Rome in the year of jubilee must pay as much money to the Pope as they would have spent in going to Rome, and agents were sent out all over Europe to collect the money which these people would have spent in going to Rome. The effect of these pilgrimages on the morals of the people was horrible. No picture can ever be painted which will truly reveal what a sink Rome became in the years of jubilee. Still this is even yet a papal method of raising money by promising salvation.

Other pilgrimages to various places are made use of in the same way. Lourdes in France, Knock in Ireland, and in Canada whither the famous relic of, which we were talking last Sunday has gone to the shrine of St. Anne de Beaupré, are all encouraged by the church as places of pilgrimages, so as to make money out of pilgrims who throng to them.

These sales I have called the sale of salvation, because baptisms, masses, and indulgences are deemed essential to salvation.

II. But, similar to these, there are sales which I may call privileges, which are not immediately, though secondarily, connected with salvation.

1. Among the privileges which the Church of Rome sells freely are marriage dispensations. There are certain kinships, or blood relationships, that people sustain one to the other, which make it impossible for them to marry unless the church permits them so to do, by granting a dispensation. Nevertheless, any one can marry whomsoever he likes, provided he buys the privilege of the Pope. Bishop Scipio de Ricci, of Italy, says that the whole business is "a shameful traffic." The Council of Trent decreed that a "Pope can dispense in any degree of relationship, whether it is forbidden by the divine law or not." I hold in my hand a copy of the rules relating to marriage dispensations in Ottawa, Canada. If you want to marry your first cousin, or your second cousin, or your aunt or your uncle, or any other relative, I can tell you just how much it would cost you there. I read from the Faculties of a priest, granted him in 1874: —

Index of fees for dispensations of matrimony in the diocese of Ottawa.

For dispensation of 1 of the banns	$2.00
" " " 2 " "	4.00
" " " 3 " "	10.00
" " " 4th degree of consanguinity and affinity	10.00
" " " the 4th degree simple, with the 3d degree of mixed consanguinity and affinity	12.00

For dispensation of 4th degree with the 3d mixed			11.00
"	"	" 3d degree simple	14.00
"	"	" 3d degree mixed	18.00
"	"	" 3d degree mixed with the 2d	24.00
"	"	" 2d simple	40.00
"	"	" impediment of spiritual affinity	4.00
"	"	" " " public decency	2.00

(I should think the whole matter of dispensations at a price would come under that head, — impediment of public decency.) (Laughter and applause.)

For dispensation of impediment of prohibited time 4.00

This note is appended in Latin (I read the translation). "The fees for these dispensations shall be sent promptly every year to the secretary of the bishop." When Prince Amadeo, the brother of the present King of Italy, desired to marry his niece a few months ago, he paid the Pope twenty thousand dollars, according to current report, to get the privilege, or dispensation.

2. Another privilege which they have on sale is that of getting out from under the excommunication when you are under it. Frederick of Trinacria paid Boniface VIII. one thousand ounces of gold to be relieved from the ban. The Emperor Frederick II. paid Gregory IX. one hundred thousand ounces of gold. The pious zeal of this Pope was followed by Clement V., who fulminated a bull of excommunication of quite unexampled character against the Republic of Venice for having refused to pay him fealty in the form of twenty thousand ducats, for the city and province of Ferrara it had lately conquered. They finally gained relief from that excommunica-

tion by paying the Pope a hundred thousand ducats. So you see the excommunication business was made very fruitful of gain. I suppose there are many people in this city this very day who, rather than be excommunicated by the church, would pay all they are worth, such is their horror, their superstitious horror, of the power of the Pope. (Sensation.)

3. Still farther, as related to marriage, we have seen that large fees have been exacted by priests in different countries, so that people of necessity must remain unmarried until governments relieved them by passing civil marriage laws. In Chili, as I told you, they were twenty-five dollars, reduced by the government to twenty-five cents. They were so high in Paraguay that only three legitimate children were born out of every hundred when the Jesuits controlled everything. What the present fee is in the American States I do not know exactly. But we know that all other than churchly marriages are cursed by Rome, so that the priests may keep the revenue they demand.

4. The canonization of saints is costly. The Chevalier Gay says in his little pamphlet on the Future of Romanism, that it costs about ten thousand dollars to be canonized as a saint. I should think it would cost a great deal more than that in most cases. Ten thousand dollars in money added to such characters would scarcely gild them.

5. There is another kind of taxation which has been rife in the church at various times, called the penitential taxes. For these taxes, privileges of committing certain crimes are granted. There is a

well-known papal tax-list which absolves men from various kinds of crime (eighteen different kinds are mentioned), provided they pay a penitential tax, so-called, to the Pope. These crimes include simony, murder by a priest, parricide, incest, arson, and so forth.

The German Roman Catholic princes in the days of Adrian VI. complained in reference to the state of things in Germany, which resulted from these methods of relieving people of sin. In an appeal called the "Hundred Grievances of the German Nation," sent forth by the Diet of Nuremberg in 1523, they desired the Pope to notice, "How license to sin with impunity is granted for money. How more money than penitence is exacted from sinners. How bishops extort money from the concubinage of priests." They declared, "that by means of these purchasable pardons, not only are past and future sins of the living forgiven, but also those of such as have departed this life and are in the purgatory of fire, provided only something be counted down. Every one, in proportion to the price he had expended in these wares, promised himself impunity in sinning. Hence came fornications, incests, adulteries, perjuries, homicides, thefts, rapine, usury, and a whole hydra of evils." These Roman Catholics and princes thought the papal methods bad for the morals of the people, and prove it by much more in exact accord with the quotation just cited.

It has always been true that the papacy has permitted people who make gain unlawfully to keep it, provided they pay a certain tax. I find, for instance,

that moneys obtained for false witness, for cheating in gambling, for cheating in weights and measures, money obtained under false pretences, the wages of prostitution, and many other things were permitted to be kept, provided the person who had these unlawful gains would pay a tax to the church. This is so well substantiated that it is beyond doubt or question. It is interesting to know that two very able authors, among the best in the Old World and the New, tell us that the robbers of the Campagna were in league with the priests, and paid to the church a portion of the fruits of their robberies for the absolution which they received.

6. A recent traveller in Mexico tells us, that in Guadalupe the beggars go to the priests with a part of what they gain by begging, and in that way keep on good terms with them. The priests are their partners. And why are you shocked at that? What do the professional Roman Catholic beggars in America do with what they get? What do the black-hooded nuns who come into your stores do with the fruits of their begging? They certainly do not spend it on dress, and by their features I should judge they do not spend it on food; but these professional beggars, of whom this country is getting too full, are begging for the church, for the priests. In the city of Washington they have the run of the departments; they can go where you could not go, soliciting the clerks, the employees of the government, everybody, to give money. It is said by one who has given the subject close investigation, that if any clerk in Washington refuses money for the

papacy when these black-hooded nuns ask it, he is a marked man, and often is suddenly discharged because he has offended them, and for no other known reason. It is further said that scarcely does a congressman arrive in Washington before he is set upon by them, with the determination to extort money from him. Does this startle you? Why? There are merchants in Worcester who would not dare to turn these same beggars out of their stores without giving them what they ask, for fear of the boycott. (Loud applause.) So when I state that the beggars of Guadalupe in Mexico are said to be in league with the priests, I have simply gone too far out of our country to find my illustration, for the Romish beggars of this city do it, the beggars of Massachusetts, of the United States.

7. Lotteries, you know, are pronounced criminal by the laws of this government. We have just had a great struggle over the Louisiana lottery, because it was debauching the whole country, and have forced that gigantic scheme of robbery to discontinue its work. But lotteries are everywhere operated by the Roman Catholic Church, as in Mexico and Canada. In Peru, also, the bull-fights and cock-fights are sometimes used as a means of obtaining money under churchly sanction. In Canada millions of dollars' worth of lottery tickets are sold by the church. I have seen one of those tickets within the last four years, bought by a friend at a church door in Montreal. The Grand Lottery of the Sacred Heart, fifteen years ago, was offering $272,782 annually in prizes. A special lottery charter is granted by the

Dominion Parliament to the province of Quebec for church and educational or charitable purposes. Such associations being classed as criminal under the general law of the Dominion! Rome is privileged in crime by this enactment. Lotteries are all condemned by the law of the United States, but when do the Roman Catholic Churches have a fair in this city or State without lotteries and gambling? There is in their methods as much chance as there is in any game at cards. A distinguished priest in our city puts up his trotting horse, encouraging his parishioners to guess on the weight of the horse at so much apiece, so getting much more than the value of the horse. A cane, a sword, a scarf, a gold watch, any one of a hundred things, is used in the raffle, which is a lottery on a small scale; the tickets are sold far and wide to get money for the church. And I am ashamed to say that Protestant churches will advertise similar things,—small theatres, cheap shows, and the like, take a fee at the door, and degrade public sentiment to make money with which to support religion! I should feel freer in talking about the lotteries of the Roman Catholic Church if we were as pure from kindred methods as we ought to be. (Applause.) Perhaps you think I should have finished the catalogue of this Romish store and its sales. I wish I had, but much more remains to which to call your attention.

8. Amulets, charms, scapulars, medals, are all sold to-day for money, in untold quantity. I can give you the names of some of them, so that you can buy one if you want to. I have not time to describe

their alleged magical powers. The Carmelite scapular, the Cord of St. Francis, the Medal of St. Joseph, the Medal of St. Benedict, the Agnus Dei, the model of St. Peter's chains, the model of a garment of the Blessed Virgin, the waters of Lourdes, etc.; while Pius IX. says that a priest can make just as good holy water as they can find anywhere, so this is also to be sold for its power to charm.

In the New York *Independent*, within the last year, Father Alfred Young, of the Paulist fathers, has written column after column to prove that it is right and wise to sell medals, which are put in watering troughs to keep cattle from getting sick, and to be used to protect people from sickness, storms, accidents, death, etc. All which articles are sold to-day in this place and in all places where Rome can keep the people ignorant enough to buy them. Father Durngoole gained hundreds of thousands of dollars for what he calls his children's orphanages, by selling these things. He had an annual income equal to that of Yale University last year. Did not you suppose that our generation had outgrown such folly? that, unlike the Indian who carries his little fetich, we had sense enough to know that a bit of flannel on the neck would not save us from being struck by lightning? Did you not suppose that we had advanced from such infantile superstition? And yet this is part of the religion of the holy Roman Catholic Church. And I have not the slightest doubt that there are people in this audience now with scapulars on. (Great sensation.)

9. But the trade in relics is another part of Rome's

store-keeping. Enough of the true cross has been sold to make seven or eight large trees, and they invented the theory that it multiplied like the loaves of bread and the fishes. (Laughter.) There are extant at least three heads of John the Baptist. There are two holy coats; and it was last year that one of these holy coats was worshipped at Treves, and hundreds of thousands of pilgrims went to see it, to be healed of their disorders. One pope says that this is the holy coat, while Argenteuil in France has another holy coat. But now I must indulge myself in reading to you a little about these relics. Last Sunday I was speaking to you of the relics of St. Anne displayed in New York. You know that relic has gone out of this country to Canada. Is that the reason why we have had terrible rain-storms and floods? (Laughter.) On yesterday morning we read that this relic had brought to the church in New York sixteen thousand dollars, and Archbishop Corrigan, at whom the mayor of New York looked up from his knees on a public platform, says that twenty-five thousand people have visited and venerated or worshipped this relic of St. Anne!

But I want you to know just where to go to get the best thing in the matter of relics, so I will give you some special directions about one famous saint: "The body of the Apostle St. Bartholomew is declared in the Roman Breviary and Martyrology to have been translated from Benevento to Rome by the Emperor Otto III. and is alleged to be *entire*. It is attested by bulls of Alexander III. and Sixtus V. But the church of Benevento alleges that the *entire*

body of St. Bartholomew is *there still*, and produces bulls to that effect from Leo IX., Stephen IX., Benedict XII., Clement VI., Boniface IX., and Urban V. (all infallible, you know), the earliest of which popes reigned fifty years after the death of Otto III. Here, then, are *two entire bodies;* but Monte Cassino claims the possession of a large part of the body, and so does Reims. There are, besides, *three heads:* one at Naples, one formerly at Reichenau, and a third at Toulouse; *two crowns of the head* at Frankfort and Prague; *part of the skull* at Maestricht; *a jaw* at Steinfield; *part of a jaw* at Prague; *two jaws* in Cologne, and a *lower jaw* at Murbach; an *arm and hand* at Gersiac; a *second arm*, with the flesh, at Bethune; a *third arm* at Amalfi; a large part of a *fourth arm* at Foppens; a *fifth arm* and part of a *sixth* at Cologne; a *seventh arm* at Andechs; an *eighth arm* at Ebers; three *large leg* or *arm* bones in Prague; *part of an arm* at Brussels; and other alleged portions on the body, not reckoning trifles like skin, teeth, and hair, in twenty other places." That is the relic business. There seems to be a good many of that saint. He has heads and arms enough for the Hindoo god. (Great laughter.) "Again, that one handkerchief with which St. Veronica is said to have wiped the face of our Lord, thereby imprinting His likeness upon it, is shown in *seven different* places. They are Rome, Turin, Milan, Cadouin, Besancon, Compiègne, and Aix-la-Chapelle. Four papal briefs attest that at Turin, and fourteen the one at Cadouin." Our historian says, "These are, no doubt, extreme instances; but there are many very similar, and they

admirably illustrate the uncertainty of relic-worship;" and yet the church sanctions it. If poor, superstitious people were doing it, simply, I should not laugh at them: I should be sorry for them; but the Pope, the cardinals, the archbishops, the bishops, the priests, know these frauds, and still they perpetrate them on the people for money. (Applause.)

3. A word as to the purchase of officers: —

III. The archbishops' pallium, which was formerly a cloak, but is now a band of woollen, the badge of official rank, used to be sold for thirty thousand gold florins. Every man who came into the archbishopric must have a new one. At Salzburg, in the seventeenth century, they had to buy the pallium three times, because their archbishops died, and it cost them thirty-three thousand ducats every time. The city of Mayence, from the twelfth to the seventeenth century, paid out three millions of florins for the same decoration. The Council of Basle denounced the whole business of pallium selling as illegal. It is carried on up to the present time, although no certain price is fixed on it as then, but it is awarded, and a present is expected, a very thin disguise for bribery and sale. It is also true that bishops used to buy promotion, and I doubt very much if any bishop gets a place now without paying liberally for it.

2. There was yet another mode of selling the Episcopal office. Taking a bishopric now occupied, in anticipation of the death of the present incumbent, the Pope sells his bishopric to another man, and possibly to another while the first is alive, to be entered upon at his decease, so that these "letters of rever-

sion" as they were called, were held by many, and by all sorts of people who could pay for them. Anybody who could pay was an eligible candidate. And "letters of reversion" had a market value.

3. Among the taxes of the church are the tithes, which have added much to her revenue, and do still. In Canada one twenty-sixth of all grains and farm products must go to the church, and the farmer must deliver it at the church house.

The Protestant tenants of Roman Catholics must pay this tithe, and if a person does not raise grain he must pay in money.

The church gets a great amount of money from celibate priests who, not having relatives, at death leave their money to the church. This is one reason why they were compelled to be celibates.

4. Peter's pence is taken to-day. It was an enforced tax in England and in all Northern Europe for a long time. Every householder had to pay so much to the Pope, in proportion to his income. Of late years, we have had this matter of Peter's pence re-originated. The present Pope having only eleven thousand rooms in his house, and about ten or eleven thousand people to wait on him, more or less, is so much a prisoner that the church is urging to have Peter's pence be taken up all over the world; and considerable of the money which you sent to help starving Ireland went, no doubt, in the way of Peter's pence to Rome. (Applause.)

5. A great deal of money is obtained through forged wills. The history of this mode of making gain began early and continues to this day. As early

as 364 the Emperor Valentinian made a law against it. The priests used their power at the deathbed to secure the valuables and treasures of those whom they confessed and absolved; and in Roman Catholic countries many families are left in poverty by this priestly manipulation of estates.

6. A good deal of the money which the Roman Catholic Church is getting in this country is being taken out of the treasury of the United States. For Indian schools, they have taken in the last few years about two millions of dollars. The utmost that has been taken by other bodies is as follows: The Presbyterians have taken two hundred and eighty-six thousand; the Congregationalists one hundred and eighty thousand; the Episcopalians one hundred and two thousand; the Friends one hundred and forty thousand; the Methodists thirty-three thousand; while the Baptists (God bless them!) have never taken a cent — not a cent. (Applause.) One of the noblest things in the history of the Baptist Churches in this country is that, determined to keep church and State separate, they have refused the bribe which has been offered them, and have never taken one dollar from the treasury of the United States for Indian contract schools. Last week the Methodist General Conference, representing this great church, much larger than the Roman Catholic, having taken inadvertently thirty-three thousand dollars of government money for Indian schools, — the General Conference unanimously declared that they never would take another dollar. (Applause.) It will be only a little while before the other churches do the same. And

you observe Romanism has taken nearly three times as much as all the other churches put together out of the United States Treasury.

7. Another way by which they are getting money is from the public-school funds. In these cases the church takes the money which is paid to the teachers, and as a result is greatly enriched thereby. Only the too great length of the present address prevents my showing you how they are receiving public funds for the support of Roman Catholic parochial schools. The reformatories and orphanages of the church, wherever the State gives them money, are money-making institutions: a very small part goes to the support of the orphans, and a very large part to the support of the priesthood.

I have but a moment in which to draw the lesson from these facts. Simon the Sorcerer was innocent compared with the papacy. All I have not told you, for want of opportunity. But I wanted you to know of just what the Roman Catholic Church is making the sales, by means of which she has gathered her enormous wealth in this and other countries. I want to ask you if you think this organization is the Church of Christ? In the Protestant church I know of nothing which is sold except the pews, and I think there is a growing feeling against this. This is also done in the Roman Catholic Church. No Protestant minister insists on even a marriage fee: he takes whatever is given him, without comment, and sometimes he gets nothing at all. Sometimes he gets a handsome fee, but in every case it is voluntary. But all baptisms, all funerals, all visitations, are entirely

free. The finances of Protestantism seem to me in general to be managed honestly and after a spirit which is in total contradistinction to that of the Roman Catholic Church. You and I are called upon to judge whether with our consent this church, with these methods of defrauding the people and leaving them in poverty, ought to be dominant and come to supremacy in this country. My purpose here to-day has not been to ridicule the people who are the dupes of priests, but to awaken at once your gratitude to Almighty God for your better estate, and your most strenuous efforts that the people who are being bled of such vast sums of money may, by the diffusion of knowledge and truth, be delivered from superstition and bondage into the glorious liberty of the children of God. (Applause.)

GOVERNMENTS COMPELLED TO CONFISCATE THE PROPERTY SEIZED BY THE PAPAL CHURCH.

Of those who obtain money by fraud and by wrong-doing, the Bible speaks thus in the Epistle of St. James, at the beginning of the 5th chapter, "Go to now, ye rich men, weep and howl for your miseries that shall come upon you. Your riches are corrupted and your garments are motheaten. Your gold and silver is cankered; and the rust of them shall be a witness against you, and shall eat your flesh as it were fire. Ye have heaped treasure together for the last days.

"Behold, the hire of the labourers who have reaped down your fields, which is of you kept back by fraud, crieth: and the cries of them which have reaped are entered into the ears of the Lord of Sabaoth. Ye have lived in pleasure on the earth, and been wanton; ye have nourished your hearts, as in a day of slaughter. Ye have condemned and killed the just; and he doth not resist you.

"Be patient therefore, brethren, unto the coming of the Lord. Behold, the husbandman waiteth for the precious fruit of the earth, and hath long patience for

it, until he receive the early and latter rain. Be ye also patient; stablish your hearts: for the coming of the Lord draweth nigh."

Slowly but surely God rights the wrongs of this world: slowly but certainly the plunderers of mankind are forced to give up their ill-gotten wealth: slowly, but without fail, the thrones of tyranny are undermined, and slaves become freemen. Of this we have illustrations on every hand, none more manifest than in the history of the gathering and the dispersion of the wealth of the great ecclesiastical organization whose spirit we are considering.

In the former discourse, I detailed the various religious privileges, advantages, and offices for which the priest receives money, including taxes, tithes, seizures, etc., through disposing of which, during all these centuries, the papal church has acquired wealth. The impression created upon your minds by the somewhat extended description of their methods must have been, first, that the papacy has many and very extraordinary ways of getting hold of the money of the people; secondly, that many of its devices are clearly and scandalously fraudulent; but thirdly, that notwithstanding the unjustifiableness and the dishonesty of their methods, they have nevertheless so far deceived society as to have acquired enormous wealth. None of those things of which I spoke to you on last Sabbath, for which the papacy receives money, are properly salable; neither baptisms nor marriage dispensations, nor masses nor indulgences; while penitential taxes, lotteries, amulets, charms, medals, scapulars, and relics are obviously worthless frauds

on the ignorant. At the close of the last service a gentleman handed to me a Roman Catholic medal which some one had given to him. A friend, formerly a Roman Catholic, to whom I showed it, said, "I wore one of those for years." The aggregate of material and art spent on that medal would not be worth more than a cent — I should think they ought to be bought two for a cent — (laughter), but probably twenty-five or fifty cents was paid for such a medal, and the profits went into the treasury of the church. There are other things mentioned in the previous discourse where the disproportion of value is infinitely greater; where the thing sold is worth absolutely less than nothing, and where the price paid is very great: the people would in every way be better off without any of those things. (Applause.) And I raise the question here to-day whether the priests in such transactions are not evidently obtaining money under false pretences. That question has been judicially raised in Italy, and I think will ultimately be considered all over the world.

1. For example, is it not plainly a fraud, an intended fraud, to take money for masses and indulgences for souls in purgatory, even when the priests believe in purgatory? We have the fact beyond all question that many of the masses promised and paid for are never said. This has been proven in the French courts. The priests in some countries, unable to say all the masses which they promise to say, farm them out, and those to whom they send them, who agree to say them, fail to do it. What is the attitude of the church toward those who have thus paid for

masses and not received them? Does she reimburse them? Never. She has deceived the people with false representations, and appropriated their money. Moreover, remember the fact which was mentioned before, that more masses are agreed to be said than there are persons who die. Therefore there are more masses promised than there is any need of, even for those who believe in purgatory. How can a church, if it professes any honesty, take money for more masses than as many as would professedly take out of purgatory the people who are in it? Moreover, when the masses are said, they are frequently, as I have many a time seen, said with a levity which verges on blasphemy. Go into the churches in France and Italy, where the poor priests are saying masses for the souls, perhaps, of the people of this city, and you will observe that the priest is dirty, his mien is careless, the boys about him who are helping him are often full of laughter and mischief, and there is nothing to suggest, even if one believed in the mass, that the intention of the priest is such as to make it avail anything. Surely, if fraud was ever manifest, it is proven in cases like this.

2. It is equally true that money is obtained on false pretences for the relics, medals, amulets, charms, which are useless, foolish, and valueless, and known to be so by the people who sell them. Do you doubt the fact that Archbishop Corrigan knew concerning the so-called relic of St. Anne first, that it was no part of the body of the late St. Anne; second, that there probably never was such a person as this St. Anne; and third, that it could not by any means do

a particle of good to the people who worshipped it? You know and I know that Archbishop Corrigan and the priests of New York must, in reason, perfectly well understand that this relic and its exposure was fraud and folly from beginning to end. Yet they took sixteen thousand dollars from the poor, ignorant people for looking upon and venerating it in the city of New York, knowing perfectly, so far as can be seen, that they were robbing them and giving them no value for their money. This goes on incessantly, under papal sanction.

The same may be said of the scapulars and the medals, the amulets and the charms, the strings, the girdles, and the rosaries which are constantly sold within the Roman Catholic Church. Those who sell them can but know that they are not good for anything: those who buy them do not. I believe, therefore, that they are legally liable for action to recover, as selling things under false pretences.

3. At the same time the taxes, tithes, and moneys from public treasuries are used, as many cases show, for the hurt and disadvantage of the people whose money is taken from them. Within the last week in the current news, — not in Worcester papers, I believe, but in papers which give us the news, — it has been stated that in the city of New York an orphanage or protectory has been drawing money from the State for children who are not in the orphanage, and never were. They have one hundred and ten dollars a year for every child whom they support; but it is charged that they have counted falsely, and taken money for children who never were in their institution. Is not that fraud? If not, what is it?

I. There are other fraudulent methods by which the papacy gains wealth besides those which I mentioned two weeks ago. You have all heard of the temporal power of the Pope. The temporal possessions of the Pope included the city of Rome and adjacent territory, and in earlier centuries a very large amount of territory in the central, southern, and northern portions of Italy. The loss of the temporal power of the Pope has been the subject of a great deal of animated protest among Roman Catholics for the last twenty years, and at the Baltimore Centennial, in 1889, the entire Congress of American Catholics protested that the Pope ought to have restored to him his temporal power. Moreover, conventions are encouraged and held in many places in Europe in the interest of the restoration of the temporal power; that is, of the territory which the Pope as prince once owned and ruled over. The temporal power, that is to say the territory over which the Pope ruled, was originally obtained by the most barefaced fraud on the part of the popes and priests. What was the method of that fraud?

1. Why, in the middle of the eighth century, the pope of Rome brought forward a document which he declared had been given by Constantine the Great, granting to the Pope certain territory and possessions. That document, the alleged donation of Constantine, was a forgery. There is not a Roman Catholic historian to-day who dares defend it, and yet the whole fabric of the papal temporal power was built up upon it. Concerning this great deception, I quote from a work of great reliability wherein Dr. Dol-

linger says, "That previous to the middle of the eighth century there is not a trace to be found of the donation which has since become so famous." And he shows that while from time to time many canonists and theologians have maintained its verity, in order to found upon it a universal dominion of the Pope, yet that after Baronius, one of the most distinguished of the church annalists, pronounced it a forgery, "all these voices which had shortly before been so numerous and so loud became dumb." The fact is, that no writers who have proper regard for their veracity now maintain the truthfulness of this donation of Constantine. Dean Milman calls it "a deliberate invention," a "monstrous fable," and a "forgery as clumsy as it is audacious," Reichel characterizes it "as an ignorant blunder and a falsehood — a falsehood, however, let it be borne in mind, which faithfully reflects the thoughts and feelings of the age which gave it birth." So just as though a forged deed or a forged will had been made the basis of an individual's possession of any property, the forged "Donation" was made the basis of the temporal power which all Romanists to-day are complaining has been taken from the papacy which stole it. (Applause.)

2. Add to this that by means of a most extraordinary forgery, the papacy obtained from Pepin, King of France, twenty cities in the year 754. How was that done? Let me read from Dr. Littledale, a distinguished Church of England clergyman, and a writer of equal learning and candor, whose "Plain Reasons against joining the Church of Rome" you would do well to read. "In 754 Pope Stephen III.

forged a letter (still extant) in the name of the Apostle St. Peter, and sent it to Pepin, King of France, calling on him to come to the defence of the Pope and the city of Rome against the Lombards, which he accordingly did, and bestowed on the Pontiff a great territory, containing more than twenty cities, the first beginning of the temporal power. Fleury, in recording this event, describes it as an artifice without parallel before or since in church history. "That is how the pope first became king." To-day I was reading the text of this forged letter affirmed by the Pope to have been written by St. Peter, the Pope acting as letter carrier between St. Peter and Pepin, and by which he gained the twenty cities! If you desire to see the letter you can find it in Dowling's "History of Romanism," page 169, where it is quoted from Bower, who unearthed the whole matter from the original manuscript in the Imperial library of Vienna (Codex Carolinus, espistle III., p. 92). If these were the whole of the papal forgeries and deceptions in the matter of landed possessions, they would certainly be sufficient to prove that they never held the temporal power by any just right.

3. But, besides, it is generally believed in the case of Matilda of Tuscany, who died on the 24th of July, 1115, and who had been apparently living in unlawful relations with Pope Gregory VII. for many years (and the proofs seem to me to be adequate), that her vast possessions came to be the property of the church by the medium of a forged will. For know at least this in regard to it: though she died in 1115, nothing whatever is heard of the alleged will when, seven years

later, Pope Calixtus signed the Concordat with the German Emperor at Worms; though at this time, had there been any such document, it must surely have come to light. Still we know that not a word was spoken of this will. It was first mentioned by Pope Honorius in 1124, ten years after Matilda's death; and finally, Innocent III., who was a mighty pope and a great ruler, in 1199, nearly a hundred years after the death of the countess, managed to get hold of her vast domain by asserting, probably falsely, that she had left a will making the Pope her heir. Another will probably forged was declared to have been given the Roman See by King Louis, the son of Charlemagne. Though said to have been given in the year 817, it was never heard of until the thirteenth century. Four or five hundred years had passed when the popes came forward and said that by the will of King Louis nearly all of southern Italy had been given them. In 817, at the time it was alleged to have been given, the territory in question was the property of the Emperor of Constantinople. So you can see that it was one of the clumsiest of all the forgeries, and yet in that age the great authority of the popes made this property their own. Those of you who have read German and Italian history know that habitually the popes fostered all manner of strife between princes, in order that they might profit by those contentions and so gain the property of the princes when they came to a settlement—the old case so often repeated in story and proverb of those lawyers who, in helping to divide a property, get it all.

4. This exhibition of fraud and forgery through all

the history of the church is in entire harmony with the whole Roman Catholic system of morality, since it abounds in lies. Canon Ffoulkes withdrew from the Church of Rome in 1870, and in a series of sermons telling why he left it, he says, "Gradually the conviction dawned upon me that this wondrous system, such as it exists in our day, was a colossal lie, a gigantic fraud, a superhuman imposture, the most artistically contrived take-in for general credence, for lasting hold, for specious appearance, ever palmed upon mankind."

This view he expands and reaffirms with an abundance of facts to demonstrate the truthfulness of his words. Let me quote once more from the eminent Dr. Littledale, when he says concerning Roman Catholic untrustworthiness, "Nevertheless, the Roman Church, which professes to worship Him Who has said, 'I am the Truth,' is honey-combed through and through with accumulated falsehood: and things have come to this pass, that no statement whatever, however precise and circumstantial, no reference to authorities, however seemingly frank and clear, to be found in a Roman controversial book, or to be heard from the lips of a living controversialist, can be taken on trust: nor accepted indeed without rigorous search and verification. The thing may be true, but there is not so much as a presumption in favor of its proving so when tested. . . . Nor can this be wondered at, when it is remembered that Ligouri, the most authoritative teacher of morals in the Roman Church, lays down that equivocation, of which he specifies three kinds, is certainly lawful at all times, and that by the

common agreement of all casuists, and may be confirmed with an oath, for a just cause, any cause being just which aims at retaining any good things that are useful to body or spirit. . . . And this broad fact as to the nature of the now accredited Moral Theology of Rome, emphasized by the very low standard of veracity amongst Roman Catholic populations, is the complete refutation of a claim, often loudly made, that the Church of Rome is the one divinely appointed channel through which the Holy Ghost exercises His functions of Ruler and Teacher." He points us to abundant and indisputable proofs from Roman Catholic authorities, distinctly and unequivocally proving that they have falsified history, falsified portions of the canon law of the church, falsified the martyrology and the fathers, and degraded the system of morality to coincide with their practices, and that they have built up a structure of untruths which is so monstrous that it is not in human power to properly characterize it. "The controversial and theological writings of Roman divines perfectly swarm with falsehoods," which fact is manifest on every hand. Of Liguori, whom Rome by solemn proclamation made a Doctor of the Church, classing him with Augustine, Ambrose, etc., Döllinger says, "He was a man whose false morals, perverse worship of the Virgin, constant use of the grossest fables and forgeries, make his writings a storehouse of errors and lies." But why expand upon an indictment so fully proven?

I know not where to begin or where to leave off, so abundant are the proofs of the frauds by which Rome has built up her power, and gained her riches.

5. I turn to another volume equally reliable, and beg you to notice the following comment on the False Decretals : " It is marvellous to contemplate the origin and progress of such a structure of fraud and wrong, to observe the popular degradation which it wrought out, as the means of securing the triumph of the papacy, and to see the patience with which the world now tolerates the insolent ambition which demands its reconstruction in the name of God and humanity. This language is not too harsh. The pretence set up in these false and forged decrees deserves condemnation in even harsher and severer terms. They were designed to secure to the priesthood the most perfect impunity, and to place them so far above the people as to put it out of the power of the latter even to complain at their oppressions. They allow a bishop or priest to commit any crime he pleases, — murder, robbery, rape, or seduction, — and deny his responsibility to the laws of the country where he resides, or to any other law but that which the Pope may enact. They command the members of the Roman Catholic Church to conceal and cover up whatsoever crimes they may commit, rather than bring disgrace upon the church. They pronounce as unworthy of belief all who are not members of that Church, so as to render the conviction of a bishop or priest impossible upon their testimony before the court of Rome, even for the most outrageous offences. They, in fact, authorize and license whatsoever a bishop or priest shall do, although he may drag his clerical robes into the very filth and mire of profligacy, prostitution, and vice."

And every word of this summary is proven by the

citations and unimpeachable testimonies which precede it.

6. As a further illustration of the method by which the papacy obtains property, I might cite the history of their getting possession of the Island of Montreal in Canada. It was owned by a French gentleman named M. de Lauson. The priests went to him and told him that they had received a command from heaven to establish a hospital on the Island of Montreal, and sought the cession of it from the owner. He declined to let them have it. Whereupon the Jesuits invented the story that when Christ said, "Where can I find a faithful servant?" the Virgin Mary took one of these priests by the hand and led him to the Divine Son, who received him on her recommendation, and gave him a ring with an inscription and orders about the community he was to establish in Montreal Island. Armed with this authority, he was able to so use his influence as to persuade the owner of the property to give it up to the church. To-day they hold their possessions in that city by this barefaced fraud on a superstitious man. If it is wrong to take advantage of a child who knows nothing, to secure what he has by treachery and deceit, then it is wrong for these Roman Catholic priests and bishops to gather the rich properties of the world into their hands by deceiving the people whom they have kept in a state of childhood, denying them the cultivation which would make them able to take care of themselves. (Applause.) By such a system, by the most persistent and fraudulent exercise of it, the Roman priests come to have extraor-

dinary possessions of houses, lands, and gold in all parts of the world. It is said on good authority, says "The American Citizen," that Archbishop Williams of Boston has vested in his name twenty-one millions in church property; the Roman Catholic Archbishop in Chicago controls forty-one millions of property; the Cleveland bishop, sixteen millions; while Archbishop Corrigan holds in his own name more than fifty millions of dollars in church property.

7. The priests make a specialty of becoming confessors to those who have wealth. Here is a young heiress who, it may be, is to have millions as her inheritance. Occasionally we read of such a one surrendering everything, putting on the robe of a nun, and going into a convent. You never see a story like this but has a tragedy in it.

Imagine the slimy courses, the serpent-like trails, the fraudulent procedure, the months and years of trickery, by which the astutest men in the world, trained especially to influence women, gain the affections and confidence of a religious young girl, get her to go into a nunnery, and deed her property to the church. She may get sick of her attempt to please them, may, in fine, leave the nunnery, but she never gets back her property. When the renowned nun of Kenmare, a most remarkable woman, Miss M. F. Cusack, left the Roman Catholic Church, a few years since, although she had been distinguished for years for her devotion and her works of charity, she could not get one dollar of the fortune which as a guileless girl she had put into the hands of the priests when she was deceived into entering the con-

vent. When the God of justice reckons with those who have deceived the young and the innocent and have stolen their wealth after this manner, I would a thousand times rather be Lazarus than to be a bishop, an archbishop, or a pope. (Loud applause.)

II. Permit me to refer briefly to the enormous acquisitions which the Romish Church has gained by these means. You will recur to what I have formerly stated as to the riches of the papacy, though in those statistics I have given you only a glimpse. I shall hurriedly, for lack of adequate time, state to you, but only suggestively, what they have obtained by these means.

1. As early as the fourth century the greedy priests of Italy had gained one-third of the soil of that fair peninsula. The jubilee, of which I told you on a former occasion, took, it was estimated, one-third of the currency of Europe to Rome. Blackstone, the great English Jurist, tells us that the Roman Catholic priests gained one-third of the property of the British Isles. One-fifth of that property was in the hands of the monks and nuns. In 1360, says an eminent historian, the Pope's revenue from England was three times that of the king. Not only was this true in our mother-land, but it has been true much nearer home.

2. In Ecuador to-day one-fourth of the property of the country belongs to the bishop. There is a Catholic church for every one hundred and fifty people. Ten per cent of the people are priests, monks, or nuns. Two hundred and seventy-two days out of the three hundred and sixty-five days of the year are feast days or fast days. Priests control the government and

dictate the laws. Three children out of every four born are illegitimate. Laborers get from two to ten dollars a month. There are no wagons outside of the capital city, because there are no roads. There is no literature. There is not a mail rout in all the country. In Chili one-third of the property belongs to the church, and they have a singular way there of having the saints nominally hold property. St. Dominic has an income of more than a million dollars a year from his estates, for which he is not taxed a penny. The government therefore gets nothing for protecting it. The priests get it all.

In Mexico, in 1857, one-third of the real estate (I wish you would take notice of the meaning of these figures. I am quoting now from the Encyclopædia Britannica) belonged to the church; also three hundred seventy-five million dollars' worth of other property in that poor little country. A recent traveller in Mexico says that three-fourths of the property was owned by the priests.

3. In Canada one-quarter of all the lands was the property of the church at the time of the English conquest, — that was long ago: more than eight million acres they had gotten into their hands in the comparatively brief space of time between the settlement by the French and the conquest by the English. There were two hundred and forty convents in Canada, of which one hundred and sixty were in Quebec, in 1875. Many of them are very rich, all of them rapidly growing in wealth.

The author of "Rome in Canada," page 345, says, "If, in spite of the statutes of Mortmain, the English

monasteries once got within their grasp one-fifth part of the lands of the kingdom, what might not have been done in Canada before a like restraint was put upon the acquisitions of the French clergy? An *Arrêt* of the Council of State, November 26, 1743, gives us the answer. In the Declaration of Louis XIV. prefixed to the *Arrêt*, the king, after stating what he has done for the religious orders, proceeds to tell what they have done for themselves. In virtue of their privileges, they had acquired such considerable properties that it became necessary to put a limit to their acquisitions; and in the year 1703 instructions were given that each of the religious orders of the West Indies should not be at liberty to possess more land than would employ one hundred negroes. But this restriction, the King distinctly states, was disregarded, and a new prohibition was issued in the form of letters patent, August, 1721, that no acquisition, either of houses or lands, should be made by these orders without the king's express permission in writing, under penalty of escheat to the domain of the crown."

Remember that the above facts are not exhaustive, only illustrative, since the like has been true of all other countries of South and Central America, the West Indies, Spain, Italy, Portugal, Austria, Poland, Bohemia, and Hungary. What a picture you have here! All these vast properties had been taken from the people. All claimed and claim exemption from taxation; for, as I shall show you next Sunday, the Roman Catholic Church is everywhere absolutely hostile to the taxation of any of its

estates. All this property, when once obtained by the church, is inalienable; that is, they do not sell it. A gentleman in a neighboring city told me that within a few months a distinguished bishop, just deceased, having bought a tract of property adjacent to a gentleman's estate, refused to sell a very small slip which would straighten the line between them, and would seem to have been of no other value, saying, "We buy property, but we never sell." All these lands and goods of Rome are inalienable, being held by the church perpetually for revenue. And in all the countries where the papacy has gained this enormous wealth, as you know and have often heard, the people are poor.

4. The church's property has given governments much concern, because they have been seriously embarrassed in carrying on their work by the withdrawal of revenues to the church, and every one of the countries that I have named has taken occasion to look into the matter of church property with a view to inquiring how the government could escape from the embarrassment of having such vast holdings in the hands of a hostile ecclesiastical power. And please to take note, that in every case, this movement to inquire into the right of the Roman Church to hold so great wealth, has been made when the people were rising in hope of freedom, and seeking to throw off the tyranny of ages. Not the hand of plundering rulers has been laid on the church, but the hand of an impoverished and indignant people, who, struggling for liberty in the midst of awful poverty, have found their extortioner and demanded that he disgorge his prey. (Applause.)

III. We come now to the kernel of this discussion. The property of the Romish Church, thus acquired, has been confiscated by the governments of most countries. You may well be startled when I use this ominous word, which indicates the hostility of the church and the struggle of the State. Such has been the insatiable greed of priests and bishops, such their enormous acquisitions of land and of wealth, that the only recourse of government has been to take it away from them by force, since they first took it by fraud from the people.

1. When by various priestly devices great amounts of money have been taken from their people, the rulers have protested. They have protested because the people have been impoverished, and the government crippled. We may admit that there may be cupidity and covetousness on the part of rulers, sometimes on the part of peoples, but it is theirs as against the greater greed of the prelates of the Romish Church.

Following this protest of governments and peoples has come the compulsory seizure of the property of the church both by monarchical and popular governments.

2. In Mexico in 1857, the property of the church was taken away by the young republic. In Guatemala, in 1843, their president abolished convents and monasteries, and confiscated the property. There was a reaction led by the priests and this work was overthrown; but thirty years later, President Barrios did the same, and in 1873 all the church property of Guatemala passed into the hands of the

government. In Costa Rica, under President Guardia, monasteries and nunneries were confiscated, the archbishop of the country was expelled, and the confessional was thrown open, and made public by law (would it were so in this country !), and Costa Rica took a step forward toward the enfranchisement of her people. (Applause.)

In Venezuela President Blanco did the same. The monasteries were turned into hospitals and schoolhouses. They drove out the nuns and the Jesuits, threw open the cemeteries to everybody that they might bury their dead without priestly interference, and turned the great Carmelite monastery into a university.

In Uruguay the religious houses were abolished on account of the treason of their occupants. President Santos first established free schools, then civil marriage, and when the priests resisted compelled them to cease from preaching because they taught treason, and then expelled the monks and nuns from the country, and gave the property to the people from whom it had been stolen. (Applause.)

3. When in Italy, in 1883, I was told that no new monks or nuns were being made throughout the country. There were many monasteries which had become the property of the government and were entirely empty so far as their former tenants were concerned. In some monasteries there were old monks, supported by the government, permitted to live there the remnant of their days, but the able-bodied had been sent out to earn their living as honest people have to do. So in Italy to-day, because

the people and their rulers have found it necessary in order to give the people a government, the monasteries and other religious houses are the property of the state, and no more monks or nuns are to be made. In 1889 there was passed in Italy a bill called "Opere Pie," a bill concerning the work of piety or beneficence as related to the distribution of charitable bequests. Vast funds had been obtained by the Roman Catholic Church for the ostensible purposes of charity; but when the government came to inquire into the use of these moneys, it found that a very large proportion of them remained in the hands of the priestly trustees, and was not applied to the relief of the people for whom they were originally given; whereupon, in 1889, the government of Italy took into its care church property, the income of which was twenty-seven millions of dollars, put it into the hands of laymen as trustees, and ordered the priests to let them alone and keep their hands off, so that this income might be given to those for whom it was originally left in an honest distribution, as it had not been for many years.

4. It is safe to say that in all these cases of confiscation of church property, the hearts of the people are with their rulers: how else could it have been done? And yet I would fain believe that all over the world people are growing more truly religious; but the evident justice of getting back what had been unlawfully taken from them has grown upon the popular mind, until these poor struggling peoples have had reason enough to inquire why they should be the slaves and why priests should be the masters.

So they have assisted the government in taking back this property, the confiscation of which undoubtedly was just.

IV. Let us now briefly consider why the confiscation of the property of the Roman Catholic Church is based on justice.

1. There are two grounds on which a government may justly take the property of public or private owners. First, in war, the property of the enemy may be taken in order to weaken the enemy and to save the life of the government. This is justified by the principle that it is the right of government to exist and to destroy the power of its enemies who would overthrow it. Moreover, in peace it is right and proper for courts representing the government to take property which has been obtained under false pretences and by fraud and restore it to its rightful owners. This right is founded on essential justice.

2. The confiscation of the Roman Catholic property is amply justified by both these principles. For first of all, in fact, the church has shown itself to be the enemy of the people. No government, in modern times, has been so injurious as the rule of the popes in Italy and of the priests throughout the world. Read the history of papal states to prove this affirmation. Everywhere the attempt to form a free government by and for the people has been met by the papacy with opposition and hostility. Therefore, as the enemies of free government hostile to the welfare of the people, it has been right for their property to be confiscated, that their power of doing harm might be weakened. Moreover, in theory, they

always claim superiority to the civil power; that government can set no bounds to their acquisition of property; that civil rulers have no jurisdiction over their holdings; that any jurisdiction on the part of the secular government over the possessions of the church is a sacrilegious usurpation. So by this means, you have in every country where the Roman Catholic Church is powerful, a state within a state, a power within a power, a kingdom within a kingdom, and that ecclesiastical kingdom utterly denying the jurisdiction of the civil powers over it. If that is not treason, tell me what treason is. (Applause.)

3. Confiscation has been justified, as I have already said, by the fact that a very large proportion of the property is gained by deceit and fraud. In ordinary business, if an article represented to be valuable by the seller, is proved worthless by the purchaser, he can recover the purchase price; and under the laws of every civilized state, if the Roman Catholics should bring action to-day against the priests for the money which they have paid for their masses, their indulences, their marriage dispensations, amulets, scapulars, charms, and the like, they ought to recover it by any fair application of the laws of equity. (Applause.) False representation, fraud, deceit, durance and threatenings, of the Roman Catholic Church should invalidate its title to much, if not all, of its property. I think I may say from my reading and research, that in all the lands where the property of the church has been taken by the government, it has been applied for the good of the people, and that it is doing much more good now than it was in the hands of the priests. So,

on the one hand, you have the church defrauding the people, and on the other the people taking back their lawful goods which had been rent from them by the church.

V. May I draw a lesson or two for the information of America from facts of such momentous importance?

1. We cannot thoughtfully suppose that the problem of other nations will not become the problem of our own government. They are superstitiously blind who imagine that America is not to deal with the questions which have involved the welfare of all other nations. The same conditions prevail in the United States of America as have prevailed in other lands. The same hierarchy is here, with the same principles, the same grasping greed, the same polity, the same articles for sale, the same assumptions of superior rights, the same claims, and the same fraudulent methods.

2. The possessions of Romanism in the United States of America are very large and rapidly growing. The best properties in great cities are continually passing into their hands. All over this country they are gaining riches by selling all their wares. They are also acquiring property by gaining political control. An illustration of this is in point. On Fifth Avenue, next to the great cathedral in New York, opposite the residence of William H. Vanderbilt, is a Roman Catholic orphanage, the ground of which is worth a great sum of money. It was leased from the city some years ago for nine hundred and ninety-nine years, at a rental of $1.00 a year. William. H. Vander-

bilt desired to erect there a museum, and offered at once to build the same and to endow it with five millions of dollars. The curator of the museum of Cambridge, England, said that with five million dollars' endowment, as proposed by Mr. Vanderbilt, it would be the richest museum in the world, and that in fifty years the proposed museum would contain all the collections and antiquities in the world worth having. When Mr. Vanderbilt made the proposition, the question was whether the Roman Catholic Church would relinquish its hold upon the land. They utterly refused so to do. So says the *New York Sun*, which tells these facts in the issue of December 14, 1885. That refusal lost to the city of New York the finest museum in the world, because the Roman Catholic Church buys or steals, but never sells. (Applause.)

3. By votes of moneys obtained from the legislators under their control, devoting people's wealth to sectarian institutions, Romanists are adding very largely to their possessions. We have had a fight in the Massachusetts legislature during the last winter to keep ten thousand dollars out of the Carney Hospital, a Roman Catholic sectarian institution, as closely sectarian as it can well be. Yet I do not know that I have seen in a public print of this city of Worcester one remonstrance against giving them this large amount of the people's money.

So all over the country, by pressure and threats, upon people, papal and Protestant, by holding tenaciously the theory of the non-taxability of their church property, by influencing officials so that they keep their justly taxable property as far as possible without

taxation, by all these means, they are gaining great wealth in the United States of America. Some limit must be put on the rapacity of priests. We have public benefactors of great liberality, who are doing much for the country, but they are not the prelates of Rome. The country will do well while it has time and strength to inquire by what right Rome gains and holds this great wealth. Not because we desire the wealth, but because we want the people to have what is their own, we protest against the possession of the enormous riches which the Roman Catholic Church unjustly is gathering to herself in the United States of America. (Applause.)

TAXATION OF CHURCH PROPERTY.

How our Lord Jesus Christ regarded the matter of the assessment and payment of taxes to the civil government, you may learn from Matthew xvii., beginning with the 24th verse: "And when they were come to Capernaum, they that received tribute money came to Peter, and said, Doth not your master pay tribute? He saith, Yes. And when he was come into the house, Jesus prevented him, saying, What thinkest thou, Simon? of whom do the kings of the earth take custom or tribute? of their own children, or of strangers? Peter saith unto him, Of strangers. Jesus saith unto him, Then are the children free.

"Notwithstanding, lest we should offend them, go thou to the sea, and cast a hook, and take up the fish that first cometh up; and when thou hast opened his mouth, thou shalt find a piece of money: that take and give unto them for me and thee."

1. In our survey of history we have learned that the Roman Catholic Church, by oppression and by the most fraudulent methods, has obtained from ignorant people an immense and almost unlimited amount of wealth. We have also learned that so menacing

have these great possessions become to the nations of the world, that in numerous instances the governments, after investigating their use, have taken them from the church and distributed them, according to their best idea of beneficence, among the people. In other words, nearly all civilized governments have found it necessary to confiscate the property of the Roman Catholic Church. We have come to a point in our discussion most interesting to us; namely, What are we going to do in our own country in regard to the property of the Roman Catholic Church? Naturally, if we are to save ourselves from the disasters and the impoverishment which have stricken other lands, we must do something to preserve ourselves from falling into the same conditions. It seems to me that the first thing necessary to do in order that our people may not become as the people of other lands, is that we, as far as is possible, so enlighten them, that they will not pour their money into the treasury of the Roman Catholic Church; so that they will not, out of their superstition, pay for worthless and useless trumpery those vast sums of money which leave them impoverished and in many cases a charge upon the State. Our first and plainest duty is the enlightenment of the people. Our second duty is to restrain by direct means the rapacity of the priests.

2. How this can be done is a question of the greatest importance; and in order that we may erect a safeguard between the priests and the people whom they despoil, I am inclined this afternoon to assert and to maintain the general principle that it is our duty,

and indeed our only recourse as a nation, to tax the property of the Roman Catholic Church.

The general matter of taxation is one of very profound interest. The importance of it to government is so fundamental that we may say civilization rests upon it, or at least could not exist without it. The amounts of money which are taken by the government from the people for governmental support are very large, so large that their magnitude would make the question of taxation sufficiently important to command a hearing from all thoughtful minds. The principles which underlie taxation are of the greatest moment, and too profound to be considered in a discussion as brief as this. With the history of taxation and with these principles I cannot deal on the present occasion, but in general I may say that taxes are a late development of civilization, and that, as we have them now, they have only come into vogue within comparatively recent centuries.

Secondly, that in general they should be levied in an equitable manner, so that none of the people will be distressed, and so that all of the people will contribute in just proportion to the support of the government. Thirdly, that the laying and regulation of taxes is intimately related to the liberties of the people. The method of taxation was practically the occasion of the American Revolution, and is so fundamental in the history of English liberty that the Magna Charta was demanded and obtained from King John, by the barons, with the purpose not only of securing personal liberty but of relieving all property from unjust and capricious taxation. It is

customary, at the present time, for the community to speak slightingly of those people who in our communities are studying most carefully the subject of taxation. I do not know of any class who are making this a special study to such a degree as those who are known by the name of "single tax men," and yet, whether they are right or wrong in their conclusions, they deserve the very greatest credit and sympathy for their investigations and researches. For one of our leading authorities on political economy has said that no man who has any regard for the liberties of the people will be indifferent to the matter of taxation.

3. Having said thus much in a more general way, your attention is now called to the fact that our Lord, in the Gospel narrative which I read, at least gives evidence of his sanction to two or three simple principles. First, he was taxed as other people were taxed under the law. Second, he paid that tax and did not seek to evade it. Third, while he did not sanction the methods of the Roman government to which he paid the tax by paying it, nevertheless he seems to me to have clearly countenanced the principle that civil government is deserving of the support of all men, and that the best of men are not too good to do their part towards sustaining the government of the country in which they live. Not attempting, therefore, to draw from the example of the Christ anything which is not in it, not assuming to give his sanction to any special form of taxation or civil government, I only wish the incident to pass for what it is worth, as indicating that he supported the

civil government by paying his proportional part of its taxes.

4. I propose to show on this occasion that the Roman Catholic Church should pay its part toward the support of the government. The alternatives as related to that church, as we learn from an historical survey, are these: either to permit oppression on her part, because she will certainly tax the people very heavily if permitted to do so; or to regulate her property by confiscation, which nearly all these governments of which I have spoken have been compelled to do in order to relieve themselves of her oppression; or, as the third alternative, and it seems to me the only one left, taxation, by which we can prevent to some extent the oppression, and through which it is possible that confiscation may be avoided. In bringing these views into a clearer light, I call your attention first to the certainty, —

I. That the Roman Catholic Church in this country is bent on the acquisition of unlimited wealth.

1. I infer this from the fact that the Roman Catholic Church here, is the Roman Catholic Church of Europe and of the world. The church here is a foreign hierarchy, controlling American citizens. This church, its rulers claim, never changes, and there are no evidences whatever of its having changed in the purpose to acquire money. Having, therefore, stripped of their goods the populations of other lands, it is obvious to me that they are intending to do it here; because, with their minds set on the acquisition of enormous wealth, they have never repudiated any of the methods which they have heretofore employed,

and are giving every evidence that they intend to apply them in this country as elsewhere.

2. Moreover, the methods of the Roman Catholic Church, many of which I have revealed in this series of discourses, are her methods to-day. Everything that she has ever sold she sells now. Every method by which she has extracted money from the people she applies to them to-day. There is not one of all the operations by which Rome has taken money from the people but what she is now actively using in the United States of America, with the exception of the worst forms of inquisitorial proceeding.

3. Moreover, she has succeeded to a very large degree already in obtaining the wealth which she seeks. Of this we have ocular demonstration. Wherever you look, on every hand, the Roman Catholic Church property is multiplying rapidly. A delegate, speaking in the Methodist Episcopal General Conference in Omaha the other day, said he would like to call the attention of the Conference to the fact that where we get church lots the Roman Catholic Church gets blocks; whole city blocks, he says, entire squares, — and by some means or other, not only gets but holds them against all comers.

It is more than obvious to anybody who has travelled through this country, that in the west, even more than in the east, the Roman Catholic Church is gathering to herself very large properties. We have no means of knowing how much she does possess, for there are no returns made which would give us a basis for that knowledge. A great deal of the property which Rome is now getting, is coming directly

or indirectly out of the public treasury. For may I not say that when we are supporting a very large number of her criminals and paupers in public institutions and from the public treasury, what we are paying for their support is to no inconsiderable extent taken from us by the peculiar usages of the Roman Catholic Church, which has deprived these dependent ones of the means of self-help?

4. Not only are her possessions great, as we have evidence, but she has avowed her determination to gain large riches in this country. Of this, there is the most ample proof. In the Dominion of Canada, which is so near to us now politically and otherwise that nothing which occurs there is a matter of indifference to us, I find the following statement of Rome's attitude concerning "wealth." "The doctrine is" (that is the doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church now in vogue in Canada); "that the interference by the civil power in the administration of ecclesiastical property is a sacrilegious usurpation, a manifest and revolting absurdity besides being a folly as great as it would be for the same authority to undertake to make the course of the stars dependent on its will. The church alone," the modern doctrine runs, "has a right to legislate on the subject of tithes: the rules it makes are strictly obligatory, and the civil power has nothing to do with this or any similar matter. It is permitted to do one thing only, and not only permitted but commanded, if it desires to exercise its legislative power with regard to ecclesiastical property; and that is, to promulgate, as laws of the State, the laws of the church in a like matter; to use every means at its

disposal to put them into execution and cause them to be observed."

"The Abbe Pelletier contends that the church's right of possession is one which the civil power cannot limit."

In a word of explanation concerning the above statement, we merely remark that the Roman Catholic Church in theory demands that the civil government shall carry out all the church's laws with reference to the acquisition of property; and the law of the Roman Catholic Church as to the acquisition of property is, that she will take all she can get, without any interference whatever from anybody in the world.

5. That I have not exaggerated their attitude and purpose, I read to you as concerning church property in our own country, from the pastoral letter of the second Plenary Council of Baltimore in 1866, — the part which I read is a portion of the article concerning church property. The council says, "We have still to lament that in many of the States we are not as yet permitted legally to make those arrangements for the security of church property which are in accordance with the canons and discipline of the Catholic Church." What do they lack in our own State, for example? What is desired by them in the State of Massachusetts? They have very large liberty of acquisition, fully as great as that enjoyed by any institution, corporation, or individual in the State.

They keep their people very largely poor. We support their criminals, paupers, beggars, insane, illiterate, saloon-keepers, etc. What more do they

want? More property, — that is what they want. (Applause.) "We are aware of the alleged grounds for this refusal to recognize the church in her corporate capacity, unless on the condition that in the matter of the tenure of ecclesiastical property she conform to the general laws providing for this object." (They remonstrate that they are asked to conform to the general laws on the subject of the acquisition of property. Your church has had no occasion to remonstrate. The church to which I belong has had no occasion to remonstrate. What is there in the laws in reference to the acquisition of property against which the Baltimore Plenary Council of the Roman Catholic Church remonstrates?) They say, "These laws, however" (that is the laws of the States), "are for the most part based on principles which she cannot accept without departing from her practice from the beginning, as soon as she was permitted to enjoy liberty of worship. They are the expression of a distrust of ecclesiastical power, as such; and are the fruit of the misrepresentations which have been made of the action of the church in past ages. As well might the civil power prescribe to her the doctrines she is to teach, and the worship with which she is to honor God, as to impose on her a system of holding her temporalities which is alien to her principles, and which is borrowed from those who have rejected her authority." And furthermore they say, "In at least one of these United States (Missouri), laws have been passed by which all church property, not held by corporations, is subjected to taxation; and the avowed object

of this discriminating legislation is hostility to the Catholic Church. In concluding these remarks, we merely refer to the attempt made in that State to make the exercise of the ecclesiastical ministry depend on a condition laid down by the civil power."

That matter in the State of Missouri was simply this: After the war the State government, according to law, required the churches to give some evidence of loyalty, and the Roman Catholic Church resented it, as intimating that she had not exclusive control over her own property.

After this Plenary Council had sent its action to the Pope at Rome, the Pope sent back an answer, which I read in part. It was directed to Archbishop Spaulding of Baltimore: —

"He" (that is the Pope), "has directed me to express directly to your amplitude, and through you to all your colleagues, his great pleasure, and to request you to thank them for the interest they have taken, and still take, *in defending the Holy See, and in vindicating its contested rights.* Moreover, his holiness has learned with satisfaction that the papal loan is succeeding also through the co-operation of the American episcopate." You notice the emphatic commendation is about church property, and the protest of the council in having civil law control their actions or estates. The Pope was also very much interested in the papal *loan.* The truth is, the action of the Baltimore Council, approved by the Pope, virtually declares that all laws by which church property is the subject of civil observation, inquiry, or control are contrary to the laws of the church of Rome; in

other words, they solemnly protest that they will have no law whatever in regard to their possession of church property except their own. This is a precise statement of their attitude. That attitude can never be consistent with the principles of civil government, — never. (Applause.)

6. Thus they are paving the way for unlimited acquisition of church property; and as years ago they obtained a third of the property of the British Isles, and as to-day they hold a quarter of the property of the state of Ecuador, and a third of that of Chili, and as in 1857 they held more than a third of the property of Mexico, they now propose to get all the property of the United States which they can, and to hold it in defiance of the civil government. They themselves so declare, both in their acts and in their theory.

One very careful student of the Roman Catholic Church in this country says that she now has two hundred and fifty million dollars' worth of property, but there are no means known to me of verifying such statement. The census of 1890 shows that their own estimate of the value of their churches is $118,000,000 and over. This does not include schools, convents, monasteries, real estate, etc.

7. Such acquisitions as they are making in this country have been in all lands where they have gained them, first of all by the impoverishment of the people. I need not go over that ground again. You know that where the Roman Catholic Church is rich, there the people are poor. Moreover, through its wealth it has invariably been a menace to the

State. That I demonstrated on last Sunday when I showed you that so menacing have been its possessions, that the State has been compelled to take them in order to maintain the existence of civil government. What have been the experiences of other lands must become facts in this, especially as they enter politics to gain this property, — threatening, cajoling, and debauching laws, courts, and legislators, in securing the possession of it, and claiming authority paramount to all other in holding, using, or disposing of it.

II. Not to dwell longer on the certainty that what has transpired in other countries will come to pass here unless by some means we interfere, I submit that in view of these certainties they ought to be restrained from gaining this property. How shall they be restrained?

1. First, by exposing all their methods and making intelligible to all the world their designs. The study of their history, to which we are giving attention in these afternoon meetings, may be the pivotal point of the salvation of the United States of America. (Applause.) The methods of this great power which is aggrandizing itself, need to be clearly laid open. When the public know what they are doing and designing, there will be raised a storm of indignation. All over this country there has been an uprising against the methods of Wall Street, and a protest from the Farmers' Alliance and from multitudes of thoughtful people against the wrecking of railroads and the speculation in stocks which is a result. Such agitation is entirely legitimate. The

understanding of the methods of many of these speculators condemns their practices. But, sirs, Wall Street is a cooing dove compared with the rapacious vulture of the Roman Catholic Church. (Loud applause.) And what I propose is that the veil be torn from their methods, and that everybody freely look in on this great system which has wrecked not railroads but nations; which has struck its blow not at private treasuries only, but which has impoverished the treasuries of governments and of generations of mankind.

2. I would, therefore, in addition to exposing their methods, value justly and fairly all their possessions. I would throw open to the light all their religious houses. I would look into all their treasuries, and I would estimate at a fair valuation every dollar of their real estate. One reason for so doing is that under the guise of being Roman ecclesiastics, many of their priests acquire enormous amounts of personal property for which they are not taxed. A friend of mine in a Western city told me only a little while ago, that he discovered (he is a minister, doing kindred work to that of Dr. Parkhurst in New York) that the Roman Catholic bishop resident in that city owned as his own private property one block of buildings in that city worth a hundred thousand dollars, for which he did not pay one dollar of tax; and the minister called together some of the leading gentlemen of the city and of his own church, who resolved that either the country should know it or the bishop should value his property and pay the tax, which they proceeded to have done. I want you to tell me

how it is that poor ignorant boys, passed by charity through the theological seminaries of the Roman Catholic Church, without ever doing a stroke of work except taking the money of the people, die possessed of hundreds of thousands of dollars, which they give to the church or by will to other ecclesiastics. And much of their property, so far as I can learn, is never declared to the assessors, and is not taxed.

3. I would compel them to support the State, for the sake of establishing the principle that the Roman Catholic Church is not supreme in this country; that instead of the nation paying tribute to the church, the church shall pay tribute to the nation (loud applause); and if one or the other of them is to be poor, the one that is rich shall be the beneficent government of the United States. (Applause.) At present, the church saps and does not support the nation. I would tax them, in order that she may support it. But proceeding still farther, and giving still additional reasons why Rome should be taxed, I observe that while this taxation will accomplish the above ends in part, it will accomplish a great deal more.

4. If we tax the Roman Catholic Church, by so doing we can discover whether or not they are loyal to this country. They profess loyalty. They profess too much to be really, confidently relied upon; their professions of loyalty are loud, their claims in regard to this country are very large. What they have done to make good those professions has not yet been great. You will see in their papers every

little while that the Revolution was fought very largely by Irish Roman Catholics; but the truth is, the Irishmen of the Revolution who fought for the nation were almost all Protestants, contrary to the Romanist claim. You will see them affirming that in the Civil War the battles of the country were mainly fought by Roman Catholics, and by Roman Catholics from Ireland; but the truth is, when you examine the figures from the War Department, there were comparatively few of them in the army, and more of them deserted in proportion than of any other nationalities in the army. (Applause.) The records of the War Department show that of the Irish population only nine (9) per cent enlisted in the Union Army, and that among these seventy-two (72) per cent deserted; more than ten times the proportion of British, and fourteen times the number of native deserters. And this I say, not to reflect on the Irish race. I love the Irish people, but Rome has debauched them, and those of them that are under Rome are not the best representatives of their noble race. In proportion as they are emancipated, in that proportion they show the glory of their character, the vigor of their understanding, and their value as citizens. But the facts about their fighting our battles are impudent misstatements, as are most Romanist claims and if they insist on lying about it, they will compel us to tell the truth. (Applause.)

5. I would tax the Roman Catholic Church, again, because she is getting more advantages in this country to-day than in any other country of the world. So they themselves admit. A recent pope

of Rome has said that there was no country in which he was so much a pope as in America; and they all allow that America is giving them very great advantages. So did Spain. How did they repay her? By tearing out her vitals. So did Italy. How did they compensate her for their privileges? By holding her in chains for a thousand years. France also extended facilities to the Roman Catholic Church. How did they reward her? By making religion a travesty of truth, and turning France to infidelity. At present they are having very great advantages in this country. Very well. In order that we may not repeat upon us the history of other prostrate peoples, let her pay for what she gets, as far as possible. (Applause.)

6. Moreover, it seems to me reasonable that this should be demanded because the advantages of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States are not advantages to the nation. I have spoken of this so fully that I need only to state it. Also, because history shows that we must have either taxation or confiscation in this matter of ecclesiastical usurpation. I would adopt the gentlest means first. If we have taxation, I think we may avoid confiscation. If we do not have taxation, I believe confiscation is inevitable; for this nation, like all nations, will come to a death grapple with her internal foes, and as she has done once, so will she do again: when the United States grapples with her foemen, those foemen are doomed to overthrow. (Applause.)

7. One other reason for taxation which I would give, is that a very considerable amount of the prop-

erty of the Romish Church is business property, used for purposes of direct revenue. I here cite to you a proof of this statement in Canada, which interested me very greatly. Please to notice the connection in which it occurs. "In the session of the Quebec Legislature, 1876 and 1877, the Sisters of Providence obtained the passage of an Act by a large majority — the vote was forty against thirteen, — giving them authority to carry on every kind of manufactures in the convent." Why should a factory carried on by a corporation pay a tax for its property and its product, and a factory carried on under the name of a convent or a monastery go free of taxation, both as to its property and its product? Let any working man answer me that. If they make revenue by the manufacture of goods, where they make that revenue there they should be taxed on manufactures and on manufacturing property. Moreover, for revenue in this country they do worse than that. "In King's County (New York) during the five years from 1871 to 1876, the cost to the people of the county from the pauperizing of children, seven hundred and twenty of whom were found to have both parents living, was reported as having risen from $40,000 to $172,000, at a price for each child so large that Commissioner Ropes said that the over-crowded asylums farmed out those whom they had no room for. The proportion in different asylums, as reported, was: Roman Catholic 1,298; all Protestant denominations, 266; Jewish, 17." Thus obtaining from the State, payments for the support of orphans, they crowd these houses with children both of whose

parents are living, and gain from the government a disproportionate sum for their support, the Roman Catholics having more than five to one of the proportion; and they make these institutions a source of revenue, pouring the money into the hands of the priests. Such orphan asylums as that should be taxed. (Applause.)

III. But some one will say, if the Roman Catholic Church is taxed, all the churches should be. Proposing to deal with this question in the most absolute spirit of fairness, I am ready to consider this claim. Is this the alternative?

1. If the Romish Church is taxed, ought all the other churches to be?

First, I will say there are peculiarities of the Roman Catholic Church which suggest that it might justly be taxed when other churches were not. Some of these already have been disclosed, but I will mention two or three such peculiarities, in addition to those which I have already named.

1. The Roman Catholic Church, unlike any other church in this country, is an alien church, whose official authority, supervision, and direction, policy and purposes come from Italy. It is not an American church. It is not an Italian church. It is a mediæval church, with its headquarters in Rome. Its officers are appointed by the prince to whom they swear allegiance, not elected by the people of this country. Further than this, all its property is owned by these same ecclesiastics, who owe their allegiance to a foreign power. Still further, all its surplus revenues go to that official head outside of

the country, who has never been a friend to the government of the United States. Claiming independence, as it does, of the civil power, having its officials only loyal to a foreign power, pouring its revenues into the treasury of a foreign power; in these respects it is entirely unlike any other church, and it seems to me can justly be considered a subject for special legislation on the ground of its manifest unlikeness to all other communions.

2. Moreover, a second reason why the Roman Catholic Church, being unlike all other churches, might justly be taxed, is this, that there is no other church which has made so many paupers and so many criminals to be supported by the government of this nation and of the several States as the Roman Catholic Church. Go where you will, to prison, penitentiary, insane asylum, orphanage, hospital, you find a very large disproportion of the money which the country is spending for the indigent and criminal classes is spent for people first who have been made poor by the Roman Catholic Church in other countries or in this country, and second, for people who are now kept poor in its communion. Therefore, I say, because they cost so infinitely more than any other church, there is a reason why special legislation should exact of them something for the support of their own dependent and criminal people. (Applause.)

3. Moreover, I add to this another reason, based on their manner of holding property. They are unlike any other church in this, that their property is not held by corporations and trustees of the people who

gave money for the purchase of the real estate or for the erection of their edifices. Their property is not the property of the people, as is the property of the Episcopalian, Methodist, Baptist, Congregationalist, and all the other Protestant churches. The property of these churches, given by the people, is owned by the people. They can repair it, or mortgage it, or sell it under the law. But the property of the Roman Catholic Church is held by the bishops in trust for the Pope. It is personal property, not the property of trustees or of the people. And when I find that these owners use it for their aggrandizement, at the expense of the people; when I find that they dispose of it personally by will, that they can sell it or not sell it as they like, — then I say that in this respect, being totally unlike any other church, they might properly be the subject of special legislation, even if other churches were not.

4. And again we may say the Roman Catholic Church, unlike any other church, transacts a very large wholesale and retail business in certain articles, for money, and as a business it ought to be taxed (applause) as other churches ought not to be. By the way, I have the latest news from Ste. Anne this morning. Two hundred thousand people bowed down to the relic of flesh and bone in New York, and instead of sixteen thousand dollars, the figure last reported which they paid to see it is twenty thousand dollars, the lowest figure that is now named as the tribute of superstition to knavery. I say that any institution which does a show business like this, where there is no expense and all profit, ought to pay a tax on receipts. (Loud applause.)

IV. Nevertheless, after showing these marked peculiarities which would justify the taxation of Romanism, I am now coming to the point where your interest, hitherto general, will be personal. If it is necessary in order to be just, if it is necessary in order to be honorable, if it is necessary in order to be equitable, that the power of Roman Catholic rapacity shall be restrained by taxation only when the acquisition of all other churches and their property is subject to taxation, then I say let all church property everywhere be taxed. (Loud applause.) I accept the alternative. All the churches are receiving unparalleled benefits under the Constitution and the laws of this free republic, and for my part I should be glad as a church member to do my part, out of the religious treasuries for the maintenance of a country which I love next to the church of Jesus Christ. (Loud applause.)

1. Other denominations than the Roman Catholic are also in danger of amassing undue wealth, though the danger is not so imminent. It is a patent fact, which they might well retort upon us, that Trinity Church in New York City is probably the richest religious corporation in America, if not in the world; while the collegiate churches of the Reformed Church in New York are likewise possessed of very large revenues. There is danger, my friends, lest covetousness should come in upon Protestant communions, and I should be willing to do all in my power, not merely theoretically but practically, to prevent us from falling into the same snare which has been the curse of the Roman Church.

2. Worship should not be a matter of State support. I judge that there are none of us here who are prepared to say that we believe the State ought to support the church or the churches. There are lands in which this is still done, but it is not according to the genius of our people, and is contrary to our Constitution. If the government is not to subsidize the church, if the State shall not support with its revenues an ecclesiastical institution, then we might well inquire whether the government should remit the just taxes on church property as a part of church support, and so, indirectly, pay great sums out of the pockets of all the people to please a part of them. There are many people prejudiced against the churches to-day because they think that they should be taxed, and so pay a portion of the expenses of government. All just cause for such prejudice should be removed.

I would like you to notice that the principle which I here announce, that the support of the church ought to be entirely apart from the treasury of the State, has been vindicated by the Baptists and Methodists very recently. For they have practically said, "Although we need money for the education of the Indians, we will not take one dollar out of the treasury of the United States, as a matter of principle; and in so resolving, they have virtually declared that they see very great danger in any union of church and State by which State funds support the church; and if this danger is so imminent that they will not take money out of the treasury for the support of their schools, why should they take it out of the treasury of the nation for the support of their churches, through exemption from taxation?

3. The amount of church property in this country in Protestant hands is now counted by hundreds of millions. There are multitudes of poor property holders who would be relieved in the matter of taxation if the church property, assessed at a fair valuation, should be taxed. You can see this very plainly. Here is a rich congregation which builds a church worth half a million dollars, and can well afford to do so; here is a poor congregation in the same city whose church cost ten thousand dollars, — and they are numerically as great as the other. If that five hundred thousand dollars, and that ten thousand dollars were added to the assessed valuation of the real estate of the municipality, the rich people who are now occupying the splendid church would simply pay their proportion of taxation for their privileges, while the poor people would be relieved in just that proportion. When the valuation of property is increased, then the rate of taxation on a dollar is diminished. Therefore, the large increase of valuation through a property of half a million being added to the municipal wealth in its assessment, relieves the purse of every poor man in that municipality by diminishing the rate of taxation.

4. If the church would freely consent to have its property valued and taxed, I have no doubt that it would very much raise the moral tone of society by so doing. Studying recently a book on taxation, a very carefully written treatise, I found this astounding statement repeated over and over again, — that it is a common thing for men otherwise reputable, to make false oaths with reference to their property, so as to

avoid taxation; that in every State in the Union most serious trouble results from the fact that men try to cover up their property instead of paying on it what is justly due. Of course this is dishonest and immoral. Let me bring forward a kindred case, and show you where the church could exalt truth and honesty. Here is a city lot or block, worth a great deal of money and constantly increasing in value. It is owned by a church. On a little corner of the lot the owners build a very small chapel. That makes it technically church property for church uses, so they maintain and hold all that valuable land without paying any tax to the government. The man of dull moral sense, who is a member of that church, cannot see any reason why if the church does so, he should not do something equivalent. In my humble opinion, if all the churches in this country would come forward in a manly way, declare all their property, and ask to have it fairly taxed, they would do more to bring up the moral standard of men who make false oaths in reference to property, than by almost any amount of preaching honesty. (Applause.)

A very large percentage of personal property now escapes taxation altogether, which is to the disadvantage of all.

I think I could show, if I had time, that consenting to taxation, on the part of the churches, would not increase the expenditure of their members for government, and would, on the other hand, equalize taxation throughout all the municipality or the State, and lessen the tax-rate.

In 1875, in a message to Congress, President Grant made this remarkable statement: —

"In 1850, I believe, the church property of the United States which paid no tax, municipal or State, amounted to $87,000,000. In 1860 the amount had doubled. In 1870, it was $354,483,587. In 1900, without a check, it is safe to say, this property will reach a sum exceeding $3,000,000,000. So vast a sum, receiving all the protection and benefits of government, without bearing its proportion of the burdens and expenses of the same, will not be looked upon acquiescently by those who have to pay the taxes. In a growing country, where real estate enhances so rapidly with time as in the United States, there is scarcely a limit to the wealth that may be acquired by corporations, religious or otherwise, if allowed to retain real estate without taxation. The contemplation of so vast a property as here alluded to, without taxation, may lead to sequestration without constitutional authority, and through bloodshed. I would suggest the taxation of all property equally."

V. Having thus announced the positive reasons for taxation of church property, I wish to meet fairly those who will bring forward objections to taxing the property of the church. Those objections I very much respect, for it is a matter of which we have thought very little. We are driven to this emergency, perhaps, as a war measure. We were not ready to emancipate the slave, until the only hope of this nation lay in his freedom. When General Fremont was ready to declare the slaves in Missouri free early in the war, the country said, "Not ready," and even the great emancipator Lincoln said, "Not ready," but there came a time when in the hot

fires of war the shackles of the slave melted. It may be we have not thought it to be immediately desirable that the property of churches should be taxed; but we have come to a time of emergeney. The peril of other nations is over-shadowing our own land, decided and wise measures need to be taken; and to lead to united action these objections need to be calmly and thoughtfully considered. When I have stated a few of them, and answered them, I have done.

1. Some of you will say, our churches are for the public good, and, because for the public good, therefore they should not be taxed. In the city of New York during the war, was formed the strong patriotic organization known as the Union League. Noble men joined themselves together to give the country an evidence of their devotion and loyalty, and to stand behind the government in its herculean work. They built a most magnificent building on Fifth Avenue. That building is the headquarters of the Union League Club to-day. The building and the club are a public benefit, and yet, although they have done so much for the nation's welfare, I do not suppose they ever thought of asking exemption from taxation on the ground that they were a public benefit. But, says one, the churches are so much a public benefaction that what they do ought to be considered an equivalent for what they receive in the way of protection. I answer, this hall is a public benefaction, and I do not know (I speak with great carefulness), that any church edifice in the city of Worcester has done more for the intellectual and moral elevation of

the city than this magnificent hall. It is a public benefit, an honor to the men who projected it long ago, and who open it so freely to the public use. But I do not think any member of its corporation ever thought of asking that the property of the Mechanics' Association should be exempt from taxation, because it is a public benefit, and is used for public advantage. Why, then, should we ask exemption for church edifices?

2. But another says, churches are freely thrown open to all; they are public property, and therefore they should not be taxed. I answer, they are certainly owned by somebody else than the public. They are owned by their congregations, and held by the officers of those congregations. They are not public property, therefore, in the technical and exact sense. And, moreover, if you say that they are thrown open to everybody, that all the people can go to them freely, I say with shame and confusion of face, would God that they were, but as a matter of fact, we know that the churches are very largely so exclusive that everybody knows who is wanted there, and who is not. (Applause.) Would I be a better Christian if I should evade the truth in the presence of this congregation, and deny the fact that many of our churches are social clubs, pure and simple, with a religious bias? (Applause.) They do not want the poor, they do not want the ragged, they do not want the dirty, they do not want the lowly, they do not welcome the people whose social standing is doubtful; and when such people come, they are treated as Jesus Christ himself in peasant garb would be

treated, if it were He, and they did not know who He was. He and they would be thrust together into the lowliest place. Why, sirs, one of the most monstrous things in the history of religion is that the churches are not open to the public in such a sense that many people who respect themselves do not go to them, because they cannot go and respect themselves; and I could pour out bitter tears here because it is true. The churches maintain the caste spirit. You can rate the property value of men by their seats in the church, — these in the broad aisle, those in the back seats, and others in the galleries. The uncovering of the shame of the church is most painful to me, but truth demands that we say that the churches are not the property of the public to such an extent that it should be a reason why they be exempted from taxation. (Applause.) Indirectly, they are for the benefit of all; no doubt that is true. So is a factory indirectly for the benefit of all; so is a private school indirectly for the benefit of all; so is every man's property which is well kept and honestly earned, indirectly for the benefit of all, but can that be alleged as a reason why the factory, the private school, and the private house and grounds be exempt from taxation?

3. It is further objected that these church members have been already taxed in their private capacity, and that, therefore, they should not pay a further tax in this benevolent work of the church. If they have paid their taxes in their private capacity as individual holders, why should they not now pay their taxes in their corporate capacity as joint-hold-

ers of property? By this method, as I have already said, poor people would be very much relieved; indeed, rich people would pay less on their property than now they pay, if taxes were levied on all property alike.

4. But another says, being religious they ought not to be taxed. You have an idea that there is a kind of sacrilege in taxing churches, because they are religious. Perhaps you are religious: is that any reason why you should not be taxed? Perhaps you do your business and hold your property conscientiously as a Christian. Have you ever pleaded exemption on that ground? Well, but, says one, these are religious in the large sense, they are religious institutions. So is Mormonism, and yet the other day the United States took a very large portion of the property of that very religious Morman Church, amounting to a million dollars or more, and applied it for the education of the Mormon youth under the direction of the government. The government practically confiscated the property of this religious organization, and by so heavy a tax they made it serve the cause of education. I appeal to history that the Mormon Church is not such a blot on the history of time as is the Roman Catholic Church. Do you say that the Mormons have murdered men, and point to the Mountain Meadow massacre? I hear the gurgle of rivers of blood shed by Rome. Do you say that the Mormons have countenanced vice by their system of polygamy? Read the histories of centuries, to tell you how celibate priests, monks, and nuns have violated all morality. Do you say that the

Mormons have oppressed the people by exacting tithes? Turn to South America, and see how Rome, by her exactions, has enslaved the intellect, plundered the treasury, and depraved the principles of the nations. No, the fact that any church is religious is not a reason why it should not be taxed. The reason must be some other than this, and the sufficient reason I think does not exist.

5. If churches are taxed, says one, thinking the matter over broadly, then educational endowments would have to be taxed. All our colleges having large accumulations of funds which are used for the support of education would necessarily pay taxes on their property. If we are going to tax church property we would have to tax educational property. I answer, educational endowments are taxed already in many cases. For example, Johns Hopkins University is supported largely by Baltimore and Ohio Railroad stock. That stock is taxed; nor do I see any reason in the world why educational institutions should not be taxed, saving those which belong to everybody, are supported by everybody, and are freely open to everybody, as are the public schools.

6. But, one replies, if you tax educational institutions you will have to tax charitable institutions, private hospitals, orphanages, and the like; and they think they find in this an insuperable objection to taxation such as I propose. My friends, is it any more oppressive to tax a private hospital than it is to tax a private physician on his own personal property? Suppose many physicians combine. Their work is not wholly philanthropic. They receive a revenue

from the institution and should pay tax. But, one says, here is an orphanage (and I have told you how Rome abuses orphanages and makes them minister to her gains), and, say they, we shall have to tax all orphanages if we tax Roman Catholic orphanages. I reply, yes; well may we do so, and why not? Yonder on a humble street is a poor widow left with four orphans under her care. Her little house is worth a thousand or fifteen hundred dollars. That is an orphanage which if any are to be exempt from taxation ought to be. (Applause.) Has anybody ever pleaded that the small property of poor widows and orphans may be exempt from taxation? If not, then why should not the property where a hundred orphans are cared for by people whose aggregate property amounts to millions, do something for the nation which will care for those orphans from now until the time when they enjoy the larger privileges of mature citizenship; befriending them through the whole course of their lives? (Applause.)

I have touched upon every objection which I have time to note this afternoon, and I think I have made clear that for the sake of so great a principle, and of so important a result, all the churches might well and profitably submit to taxation, ay, and welcome it gladly, unless they propose also, which I do not believe, to become the oppressors of the people, when it is their duty to give them liberty and salvation. What should be exempt from taxation? The things which are the common property of all, as I have just said, and which the public all freely and equally use.

With all that has been and might be advanced to

justify such a conclusion, I believe that the churches would be ready to bear their part in the support of the government. Rome alone would resist to the last. Of Canada, Lindsay says ("Rome in Canada," p. 365), that the laity are feeling the burden of the immunity from taxation which the church enjoys, and have raised the question of taxing it. "Already the episcopate is on the alert, and has made a sign which shows that it intends to resist the change with all the power it can command. In a circular issued in November, 1875, the seven bishops on the strength of their united authority, instruct the priests that if the municipalities or other civil authorities speak of taxing the property of the church and of the religious communities, the priest is to communicate the fact to the bishop, under pain of excommunication." No blow strikes to the vitals of Rome like enlightening her people and diminishing her revenues. Rome would resist taxation with excommunication. Rome alone would protest that taxation could never be permitted without a sacrifice of her laws and rights. Rome alone would resolve that it should not be, since her taxation would be her death. So be it. (Applause.) If it be death to any church, Roman or otherwise, to help support this government by fair taxation, then let it die. (Applause.) But, as I believe, by standing squarely for the principle, we can protect the nation, upbuild religion, emancipate the people, and checkmate the rapacity of the priests. (Applause.)

NO. XI. CHURCH AND STATE: THEIR TRUE RELATIONS.

"THEN went the Pharisees, and took counsel how they might entangle him in his talk.

And they sent out unto him their disciples with the Herodians, saying, Master, we know that thou art true, and teachest the way of God in truth, neither carest thou for any man: for thou regardest not the person of men.

Tell us therefore, What thinkest thou? Is it lawful to give tribute unto Cæsar, or not?

But Jesus perceived their wickedness, and said, Why tempt ye me, ye hypocrites?

Show me the tribute money And they brought unto him a penny.

And he saith unto them, Whose is this image and superscription?

They say unto him, Cæsar's. Then saith he unto them, Render therefore unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's: and unto God the things that are God's.

When they had heard these words they marvelled, and left him, and went their way."

In speaking to-day upon the subject of Church and State in their mutual relations, I take for my text the

words at which the Pharisees marvelled, when they had undertaken to entangle the Lord Jesus Christ in his talk: "Render therefore unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's."

1. By the progress of our thought, which I believe has been so connected that what has followed has come in orderly sequence from the premises going before, we on last Sunday urged that the only possible way by which the government of the United States could check the rapacity of the priests and protect the interests of the people was to lay a tax on the property not only of the Roman Catholic Church, but in order that equity might prevail and objection might not justly be offered to so doing, that it should, in the exercise of its administrative functions, lay a tax on the property of all the churches. The supremacy of the government in matters of property must of course be assumed from its right to levy such tax, and the relation of the church and the state can in part be inferred from such an act on the part of the government.

2. That this relationship is a matter of serious concern you may infer from the fact that the recent national Republican Convention at Minneapolis inserted in its platform a plank in which it expressed with emphasis its belief that the church and state ought to be kept separate. This does not mean, as I understand them, that the church should be excluded by or from the state, or that the church should attempt to exist independently of the state, but that church and state should so coexist and harmonize that

neither should trench upon the rights of the other, and that both should conserve the very highest temporal interests of the people. Plainly that convention would have made no such deliverance if there had been no occasion for it. Still more obviously is it evident that unless they had believed that there was danger of the church and the state coming into relations which would militate against the welfare of the people, they would have made no pronouncement concerning them. A deep-seated fear exists in the minds of the people of this country, born of their intelligence and their knowledge of human history, lest the civil liberties which we enjoy, and which are as priceless as they are excellent, may somehow be filched from us; and an equal fear exists on the part of our people who know how through many centuries the nations have struggled against religious tyrants, lest somehow that rare and marvellous religious freedom which we enjoy in this country should likewise be lost us. There never has been an hour in the history of the American state or in the history of Christianity in the United States, when the people would not rally, if they really began to fear that civil or religious liberty were in any wise imperilled: for I believe as a principle more settled than the rocks of our hills, more firmly ingrained than the phraseology of our Constitution, there has been born into the American people a purpose to be free. (Applause.) That purpose takes form as the exigencies of the time suggest, but you can wrench from us anything sooner than our consent to be tyrannized over, whether in the state or in the church.

Our fear is based on the history of nations. We know somewhat of the sufferings of humanity and the struggles of government in other lands. We know that where the church has been tyrannous it has been degraded, and the same is true of the state. We have a conviction that the separation of their organized governments and heads is for the general good. We never want the time to come in this country when a priest shall be President, or when a President shall be priest.

3. Our Lord, in the words which I have taken, said more than I could explain in an hour's speaking. He did not contrast the civil government with the ecclesiastical government. He did not say, "Render to the head of the civil state what belongs to the head of the civil state, and to the head of the ecclesiastical hierarchy what belongs to the head of the ecclesiastical hierarchy," but he said, in the support of civil government, "Render to the ruler, as embodying the government, what is his due, but have personal relations with God in matters of religion, and directly to him, not through a Cæsar or a pope, — render to God the things that are God's." (Applause.)

The civil state is undoubtedly included in the divine administration. The duty of reverencing rulers is laid down as a part of human duty; but I do not find Christ anywhere teaching that there is any ecclesiastical order which has such relation to us as has the civil order, but that, on the contrary, we are to perform our duties to God direct and our duties to man partly through contact and association and partly through the civil state.

I. The relations of church and state have been a matter of profound interest among men for centuries. 1. Three views have prevailed. The first, of the supremacy of the church, its absolute authority over the civil government. The second view is the supremacy of the state, its absolute precedence over the ecclesiastical order. The third view is that of the reciprocal independence of both, which involves the absolute authority of neither the one nor the other. All three methods have been tried, and tried through extended years. The doctrine of the supremacy of the church is the doctrine wherever the Roman Catholic Church has had or now has power. The doctrine of the supremacy of the state was adopted by the Reformers and the churches of the Reformation as a reaction and protest against the cause of the sufferings which they had endured at the hands of a supreme hierarchy. The doctrine of the reciprocal independence of church and state has not, so far as I know, ever had a field for complete exercise except in the United States. I find that writers who discourse upon this great theme suggest the United States of America as the country where the reciprocal independence of the church and state is having its most noted illustration. You will notice in your reading of modern European history the word Concordat now and then, and undoubtedly many of you know that a Concordat is a sort of treaty of peace between the Roman Catholic Church and the civil government, by which they undertake so far as they can, through mutual concession, to live in concord. There is a Concordat between the French

government and the church made by the first Napoleon, broken and afterward restored; between the Austrian government and the Roman Catholic Church made by Franz Joseph; and these Concordats are only an indication of the endeavor of civil government to get along peaceably with that church which claims supreme authority. Slowly but surely the supremacy of the Roman Catholic hierarchy is departing from it.

2. I cannot on this occasion undertake a philosophical discussion of the relations of church and state in all their profoundest significance. It would be of very great interest. In order to do it I should need a volume instead of a sermon. It would be necessary carefully to define what is meant by the church; the essence, the organization, the government, the rights and the duties of the church. It would be equally necessary correctly to define the state; what we mean by it, geographically, governmentally, constitutionally, and in all ways. Detailed considerations of the function of the one over against the other among the same people might well call for the most varied historical information and proof. Upon this profound general question I cannot enter. I will narrow the scope and perhaps intensify the interest by considering the actual relations of the church and the state in this nation, not considered abstractly but practically.

II. The churches of the United States are certainly related to the state. 1. The religious census of the United States, just taken, shows us that there are about one hundred and forty different denomina-

tions and religious organizations in the country, which have their own peculiarities. Of this one hundred and forty separate bodies, I suppose, counting out the communistic societies, it may be said that somewhat more than a hundred are religious denominations of one sort and another. Of these bodies of religious people, united together by religious ties, and administering to the spiritual instruction of the country and of the world, we may say that most of them are in no conflict whatever with the civil government, either of the nation at large or of the States in which they live. Neither their creeds nor their sense of duty bring them into any conflict with the laws which as citizens they have assisted to make and which as citizens they help to support. In matters of church control, of discipline, of morals, of education, of holding property, of civil duty, of civil allegiance, in fact, in all details of life, they are practically at one with the state. As to the principles which these churches announce, they are not generally found challenging the Constitution or the laws. They are not, as bodies, seeking to control politics. It would be very difficult to say on which side politically are the majorities of the various religious denominations, taking the whole country at large. They are interested in all public questions, but they are never found dictating a political party policy. They utter themselves, for instance, concerning the treaties of the United States as excluding the Chinese. They speak their mind on the liquor traffic. They declare their convictions on all questions of the public welfare, but you do not find that they

formulate a political policy or that they attempt as bodies the control of the national legislation. These churches, of a hundred denominations, so varied in many of the minor principles of their church life, and some of them quite at variance in a portion of the larger matters of church administration, are almost all found to harmonize with the government in that they regard the public welfare as a matter of great and common interest. They endeavor to increase the security and safety of all people in the state. They hold in high esteem the morality which the civil law undertakes to support. They foster morality and virtue as the civil state does, and more. They are profoundly interested in the enlightenment and education of the people and take strenuous measures to assist therein. They labor for the maintenance of high character in all the relations of life and in all departments of human activity. In these respects, I say, they seem not in antagonism but in entire harmony with the state, while they represent the best, the most progressive, and the most enlightened portion of the population.

2. In general, I may say, there is no apprehension that they will ever do the government any harm. The voice of the Republican convention at Minneapolis, with reference to the relation of church and state, has not in it any thought that the large majority of these churches will ever give the government any trouble whatever. They know that they will not. Occupying the attitude which they do, the relations of these churches to the state are rather matters of philosophical inquiry than of practical urgency. I might raise

the question here before all the varied forms of Christian belief which are represented in this audience today, what interest have you in considering the relation of the Baptist Church as an organization to the state; or of the Congregationalist, or the Episcopalian, or the Methodist? Your interest is merely theoretical. You know the relation of these churches to the state, and you know, be you Republican, Democrat, or Prohibitionist, that the planks in the platforms protesting against the union of church and state have nothing whatever to do with these churches, either with their statutes or their civil life or their religious ideas, their administration or their discipline. The question, then, is being very rapidly narrowed down.

3. I promised you a practical discussion. We cannot have it concerning these denominations in general: but among the religious organizations classed as churches in this country, there are two which have raised the gravest fears and awakened the most serious doubts in the minds of all intelligent and thoughtful people. One of these is Mormon, the other is Roman. When this plank of the platform of politicians and statesmen is made, it does not intend to go outside of these two. (Applause.)

And when you think of the relation of church and State in this country as having in it anything to fear or anything to dread, your thoughts never go outside of those two. The Mormon Church has given us a great deal of trouble. It has assumed to have direct revelation from heaven and that nobody should interfere with it in carrying out those directions however immoral. Its head was the president and civil ruler

of all its members. It set up a domestic morality of its own which was immoral. It exacted tithes of its people which were oppressive. It favored the idea of blood atonement, and murdered those of its members who could not be otherwise forced to follow its dictates. It assaulted settlers and even the troops of the United States. It educated its children only in the tenets of the church and not to make them good citizens. This church, this Mormon Church in a distant part of our country, was believed and is believed to be dangerous to the common welfare. The general government has legislated concerning it. They have tried to diminish the power of its hierarchy. They have legislated against its immorality. They have taken away its property and its tithes. They have set up schools in order to make its people intelligent. Still there is very grave apprehension as to the influence of Mormonism throughout the country. And Utah is not a State to-day solely and only because the pressure of the moral and religious sentiment of America is so strong against the admission as a State of the territory governed by hierarchs and favoring the violation of the laws of the United States.

3. The Roman Church also has done all these things. Scattered more widely, it has not yet received special attention from the government, but it has given special attention to the government. It also claims direct revelation from heaven, perfect, absolute, and dictatorial. It also claims the supremacy of its leading priests and hierarchs over all civil rulers and affairs. It also gives us in its moral theology an amount of obscenity, and in the celibate life of its

priests and nuns an amount of immorality, which is apparent to any student of history and startling to every lover of the home. It also oppresses the people who are under its care and enriches itself by despoiling them. It also, in a hundred cases, has left the people illiterate, and would in this country neglect to teach them if there was not money for priests in parochial schools. (Applause.) It is this curse and the other, but mostly this, which is the object of the thought of our statesmen when they look to the danger which may arise from the union of church and state. Are you afraid here of the probable influence of Mormonism on this part of the country? No, I think not. So then, to be practical, this discussion, in order to have relations to you, must be narrowed down still farther, and to this point. The question is: Shall Romanism rule the United States, or shall the United States rule Romanism? This question I propose to discuss.

III. The Roman Catholic Church is in conflict with the state at many points. We have now been in existence as a nation something over a hundred years, and I think we know pretty well what we want in our civil government. We have carried out to an extent our Constitution, have legislated through this century and have crystallized quite a little, have gained in intelligence no doubt very much, are rising, I think, in moral tone, have learned more about the history of the world, and I may say, addressing an audience of intelligent American citizens in this old Bay State, that the state knows about what it wants. It knows also about what it does not want.

1. We do not want a state church supported from the public treasury: of that we are sure. (Applause.) Neither state funds nor state control are best for churches in European or American countries. But disestablishment is sure to come, and we all favor such severance of the church from the state. We know that we do not want any church in this country supported by the state.

We do not want a church which owes supreme allegiance to a foreign ruler: we are very certain of that. The doctrine of James Monroe that we do not want European powers on this continent is not more firmly fixed in the minds of the American people than this kindred proposition, that we do not want a church which owes supreme allegiance to a foreign head. We know that we do not want any of our citizens under an absolute monarchy. I am just as much interested in having the humblest Irish boy in this country a freeman as I am in having my own boy a freeman. (Loud applause.) An absolute monarchy is not good enough for any boy on American soil whom I ever looked in the face. (Applause.) We do not want a church which exacts of its officers an oath that they will obey a foreign ruler. The Roman Catholic Church exacts that oath of its bishops and its priests if not of its members. For I am sure we agree on this, no oath of allegiance will be tolerated in America to any other than the American state. (Applause.)

We do not want a church which takes its politics from Rome. Mgr. Preston, before a court of law in New York City, says, "Every Roman Catholic must

take his politics from Rome." We are just as certain as we were before he said it, that we do not want anybody in this country to take his politics from Rome.

We do not want a church which in matters of common law refuses to submit to the civil government. We do not want a church which attempts to over-ride by force or by fraud what it does not agree with. We do not want in this country a church which opposes the widest diffusion of the kind of education among the people which will make them fit to be citizens of the American Republic. We do not want a church which demands for her priests that they be exempt from the action of the common law and be tried only by ecclesiastical courts. No matter who is the priest, he is only a man, and as a man, the courts of the United States are good enough to judge him for this world. (Loud applause.)

We do not want, we know we do not want in this country, a church which assumes the right to nullify the laws and which affirms that this or that law shall be null and void, as Pius IX. affirmed in the case of half a dozen countries, some on this continent and some in Europe, within the last thirty years. We do not want a church in this country that is resolved to change the laws in violation of the liberties of the people, in order to enhance her own power.

2. We do not desire in our territory any organization which does any of these things, whether it is a church or not; and yet we are no less certain of the fact that every one of these things which we do not want in this country is part of the fundamental law

and purpose of the Roman Catholic Church. In matters of education, of allegiance, of jurisdiction, of property, the Roman Church, like the Mormon Church, has taken a position in absolute antagonism not only to this government as such, but to any form of government like our own; and if the Mormon Church by its attitude is in real conflict with the government of this country, much more is the church whose dictator and whose divinity sits enthroned on the shores of the Tiber.

IV. Moreover, as I discuss the relation of church and state, that is, the relation of the Roman Catholic Church to the American state, I am prepared to avow and defend a principle as broad as this: No interest is represented by the government of this country which would be safe in the hands of the Roman Catholic hierarchy. I repeat and emphasize: No interest is represented by the government of this country which is or would be safe in the hands of the Roman Catholic Church.

Manifestly there are interests which are common to us all. Some of us are rich and some of us poor; of some of us it may be said that we tremble on the verge of age, and of others that we are faltering on the threshold of youth; some of us are uneducated, others of us are trained to the highest point of which our minds are capable. But whatever we are, and whatever our personality or our peculiarities, there are profound interests common to us all which are an essential part of the national and civil life, and these things, which are so obvious as to be beyond debate, which are so dear as to be beyond price,

would not be safely administered if in the hands of the Roman Catholic Church.

1. Would freedom of the person be safe under her jurisdiction? Ask the Inquisition, not the Inquisition of three hundred years ago, but the Inquisition of 1870, which enlightened Italy at that time stamped under foot. Ask the history of the states where Rome has had supreme sway, the papal states as they were when Victor Emmanuel entered Rome, when every free man was likely to be taken out of his bed at night by the spies of the papacy, and without trial or jury incarcerated for an indefinite time in the dungeons of the church.

Would freedom of opinion be safe in this country if the Roman Church had power? Ask the Index, ask the thousand anathemas of the church, ask the history of the Montreal Institute, the Institute Canadien, where but a few years ago the church fought with all its might and intensest bitterness against an organization which had for its purpose the cultivation and enlightenment of men, because they had avowed toleration of opinion as one of their principles. Would freedom of opinion be safe with the bishops, with those who excommunicated Von Döllinger, with Archbishop Corrigan persecuting McGlynn, with Bishop McQuaid pursuing Lambert, with Bishop Elder threatening Editor Owen Smith? Would freedom of opinion, I ask, be safe in the hands of these hierarchs. (Sensation.)

2. Would freedom of conscience? Ask the syllabus of 1864, the infallible word of the infallible pope. When did ever freedom of conscience thrive under

Romish despotism? Ask the myriads of Roman Catholic people who have no conscience of their own, but simply the conscience of the priests for their guide, whose ideas of morals are made up on what is told them, and who have no more idea of personal conscience as you have it than they have of liberty as you define it, or truth as you hold it.

Would education be safe in the hands of the Roman hierarchy? Ask the countries which she has educated. Ask the children of Spain and of Italy, of Portugal, of France, of Austria and of Hungary, of Mexico and South America. The great educational interests of this Republic are of more concern than its tariff or all its material productions; but those interests, so vast and so glorious, can never be intrusted safely to the Roman Catholic Church. (Applause.)

Can we trust them to govern the family and regulate marriage? Ask Chili, ask Ecuador, ask Peru, ask Mexico. Can we intrust to them the care of the family? May we not well pause to consider a recent tragedy in these United States menacing to every home, which is, I doubt not, fresh in the minds of many of you. When Walker Blaine died, many of you were deeply saddened for the sake of his father, who leaned on this promising son, already illustrious and giving promise of a brilliant future. When the married daughter so quickly followed her brother to the tomb, we all, irrespective of every sentiment but that of tender humanity, felt a deep sorrow for the most brilliant man in American citizenship, who alas! was not removed by high station from the bereavements of our common lot. When last night we heard that Emmons

Blaine also was dead, I do not doubt that many a man who criticised the illustrious father a fortnight ago went home with wet eyes when he thought of that father's heart breaking under this almost unbearable loss. Yet the heaviest blow which has fallen on that illustrious man in all these years has been not the death of his dear ones, nor the disappointments incident to a political career, but that when his youngest son, a mere lad, buoyant and careless as many a lad might be, was led by a Roman Catholic girl some years his senior to a Roman Catholic priest in the city of New York, that priest, consulting the archbishop of New York, who will never forgive James G. Blaine that he is not a Roman Catholic, the archbishop directed his priest to pierce the very heart of that family by performing a marriage ceremony for which the youth was in no wise fitted. The priest could have telegraphed the father, and learned in a half-hour of time whether his consent would be accorded. This he well knew, but I believe that Archbishop Corrigan desired the marriage of young Mr. Blaine in order that he might annoy, insult, abuse, and degrade if possible, one of the greatest men that America ever had and one of its most prominent families. (Applause.) When I heard it, I wrote his father to that effect, that he might know that among many American hearts there were some who knew the inveterate hatred of these celibate hierarchs to the family which repudiates them, and I said to him that in Mr. Blaine's person and Mr. Blaine's family they struck a blow at every citizen and family of the nation. Could we trust the family to them? God forbid. (Applause.)

3. Could we trust the finances of the country to them? As well trust Captain Kidd and Jack Cade with your money! (Applause.) How have they administered the finances of countries? They have made them bankrupt. Laveleye, the great French Catholic, says in his remarkable essay on the Roman Catholic and Protestant nations, that the relation of Romanism to the finances of nations is one of injury and disaster. He says while English three per cents are at ninety-two, French three per cents are at sixty only; while the funds of the Dutch, the Prussians, and the Swedes are at par (the government funds), those of Austria, Italy, Spain, and Portugal are lower by from thirty to fifty per cent. Wall Street knows if it would speak, the Bank of England knows if it would declare, the great political economists of the world know if they would affirm, that when Rome undertakes to handle their finances she ruins the people and destroys their credit. Could the nation trust Rome with its money?

How as to public improvements, suppose we left to them the improvement of our surroundings in the state? They would leave us like Ecuador, where they have not a road for a wagon outside Guayaquil, the capital. Could we trust to them the literature of the country, and to their censorship? Why, Laveleye says you may notice that the literature of Roman Catholic countries is in moral tone far below the literature of Protestant countries. He contrasts the literature of France and of England, shows us how vile is the one and how elevated the other. We cannot trust the literature of the land to them. No; for

when their theology is so obscene that no man dares to print it in English, what can you expect of their literature? (Applause.)

Shall we trust them the government in any sense? Can we? I observe that in the latest and best encyclopædia of religious knowledge which has been published, the Schaff-Herzog, it is distinctly stated as to government, that in the papal states where the Pope had his own way entirely, the government was just as bad as it could possibly be. And this is true.

4. You may ask any history, past or present, what practical beneficence has the Roman Catholic Church worked that she should be supreme in this nation. They lift their hands and vow that they will be supreme here. When they are supreme in this country, there will remain of the national fabric only ashes, not even fire; for the blood of freemen will have quenched even the coals of the conflagration. (Loud applause.)

V. But I must hasten, for I see that the hour flies rapidly. The claims of the Church of Rome, on which she bases her right to rule, are false claims. You may observe that I repeat somewhat that I may sum up what I have said hitherto. You know that every lawyer before a jury (and I am reasoning with you as a jury of the American people) must needs repeat sometimes in order to come to just and impressive conclusions. So I reiterate that the claims of Rome to be supreme are false claims. They affirm that they alone represent God on earth in his proper right to rule. I would undertake to support another proposition much more readily than that: I think I could

prove that the Roman Catholic rule is direct from the devil, not from God. (Applause.) I am certain that they can never prove it to be from God. Put it on grounds of history, of reason, or of revelation, on what they have done and produced, and the devilishness of it is clear while the godliness of it is invisible. (Applause.)

Shall the state be supreme over the church? they cry; and Americans hesitate because they have not thought that question over very seriously. But I am ready to answer that when the state is more moral than the church, the state should be supreme over the church. There was a time when the churches of the South in these United States defended human slavery even with their lives. Which was the more moral, the state which abolished slavery, or the churches which sustained it? Undoubtedly the state. Which, then, by every law of humanity, ought to be supreme? The state. No one can dispute this proposition and be reasonable. The church, they say, should be supreme in the training of the young. That depends entirely on how it trains them. In Mexico the church had a chance to train the young and left them illiterate. Then the state took it up and taught them to read and write. Which had a right to supremacy, the church which had neglected them, or the state which taught them? Ask the intelligence of mankind at large. I think I may say that the state, using the term for the very broadest thought of civil government, and taking the world at large, has done more for the education of the young than the church, including all churches, save as they have been an

inspiration to the state. Certainly civil government has done much more to educate the people than has the Church of Rome.

They say that the church has a right, as representing God, to all the world's wealth, declaring that it is all his; they avow the church to be his heir and assignee which ought to have it all. But you will notice that, in trying to be just and merciful, many nations of the world have taken away the property of the church in order that it might be used in a really benevolent and godlike way; and in so doing, as they have taken it and distributed it, they certainly have shown more of the spirit of God than the church in seizing and holding it. The Romish principles are wrong, distinctly erroneous and false. I believe in the right of the best to rule; and if the state is a great deal better than the church, as this American state is infinitely better than the Roman Catholic Church, then I say the state shall rule. (Applause.)

The church, say they, is divinely ordered and should therefore govern the state; for, to the inferential idea, the state is not thus divinely ordered. But when this divinely ordered church governed the papal states and made everybody in them as wretched as they could be, except the priests and criminals, where were the evidences that it was a divine government? And this day I believe there are more signs of God's presence in the government of the old State of Massachusetts, more evidences that God is in this civil order, than there ever have been evidences that God was in the government of any state under papal control; and I tell you, my friends, when you know what

kind of a legislature we have, that is saying a good deal. (Laughter.)

Thus her assumptions, one after another, can be shown to be entirely fallacious.

VI. There are harmonies between the church and state which ought to exist, and cause them mutually to help each other and mankind. They are both of divine origin, I may say, speaking of the church at large. The church proper is not the mechanical organization of any denomination, but the obedient followers of the Lord Jesus Christ in every denomination and outside of every denomination. The citizen and the Christian of any church and state unite in the same person, and perform duties incumbent on man toward his fellow, uniting in the same man the loyalty of the citizen with the devotion of the saint. The state is not organized for the express purpose of teaching religion; the church is: and both practise the law of God in human intercourse, as the one labors for the adjustment of their conditions here, and the other adds to that, labor and effort for their highest welfare hereafter.

Church and state cannot coexist when the church stands for the few and the state for the many: when the church stands for despotism and the state stands for democracy, it is not possible that the two should agree or accord. When the church grows rich, and the nation grows poor 'as a consequence, the church and state cannot coexist. When the church annuls the laws which the nation makes, they cannot agree together. When the church educates not for citizenship in independent action, but only for obedience in

subordinate action, the two are diametrically opposite. When the church claims to declare the dictates of heaven and realizes less virtue, she cannot claim for herself supremacy over the more virtuous state. When the church rulers, as rulers, declare their ascendency over the elected rulers of the state, and demand the allegiance of state rulers to them, the church and state cannot coexist. When the church, any church, undertakes a monopoly of all religion, demands the state moneys for its support, and drives out all other forms of relief, then church and state cannot exist together. Professor Laveleye tells us that the Romish priests all over Europe are resolved that they will never submit to the government of the state, and they are therefore fomenting and preparing, as rapidly as they can, one of the most terrific revolutions in the annals of history. Having resolved that the church shall again be supreme as in mediæval times, so far as possible, they are working with assiduity and ingenuity as great as it is dangerous, to precipitate a conflict in which, while the nations are broken, the church shall rise to supremacy again. He might truly have said that the same is being done by the priests in this nation. The marshalled forces of the papal power have organized for the conquest of this country. They have carried the outworks. They have captured our great cities. As Fort Sumter fell, so the cities of America have fallen into the hands of the papacy. As Fort Sumter falling roused the nation, I would that these cities in their degradation might rouse us again. As yet we have taken it calmly,

idly, indifferently. RISE, FREEMEN, RISE, and make the principles of the Constitution of the United States forever supreme over the assumptions of any tyrant on these western shores. (Loud and repeated applause.)

ROME'S AVOWED PURPOSE TO CONTROL THE STATE.

THE subject of my discourse to-day is: The Avowed Purpose of the Papacy to Rule this Nation: Her Success, especially in Great Cities. Very closely allied to this topic is the holy word which you will find in Psalms xii. 2: "The wicked walk on every side when the vilest men are exalted."

1. The opening sermon of this series was on Religion and the State, in which I endeavored to show how intimately true religion is connected with our national life, and how antagonistic to that life is false religion. Then proceeding through a brief outline of the history of the colonial period of the Western Continent, I showed how Spanish Romanism had ruined the native peoples and laid the foundation of weak and disorderly states, while English Protestantism had laid the broad basis for a magnificent empire of liberty. With careful reasoning and abundant historical proofs, I then proceeded to point out the identity of the papal method of government with the worst kind of despotism, and to show that the Inquisition, as an agency of that tyranny, was an absolute necessity of the papal system of government,

and had continued to be used by it just as long as it had control. I then found one of the springs of the Inquisition in the papal greed of gold, and disclosed to you, with much pains-taking and care, that the avarice and rapacity of the priesthood had been without bound; and then in our farther survey, in demonstration of priestly covetousness, we learned that every civilized government where the papacy once had power had been compelled, sooner or later, to confiscate the property which it had unlawfully acquired; and I suggested that such would be the inevitable outcome in this country, unless by taxation, as a more lenient measure, we in some way stayed the rapacity of the priests, and by enlightenment prevented the people from yielding their substance to the hierarchy. Last Sabbath I undertook briefly to define some relations of church and state, noting some of those principles in our government which can never but be dominant, and others which are contending with those for the supremacy. It is my purpose now, in a perfectly logical sequence, as approaching the culmination of this entire series of truths, to show you that the papacy has fully avowed its purpose to exercise supreme power over the government of this country, and that this avowal, so far from being a mere wordy threat, has already been put into very remarkably active operation, and has been carried to a visible success.

2. No text more than this which I have chosen, could illustrate more completely the great truth which has been repeatedly brought out in all these discourses. "The wicked walk on every side when

the vilest men are exalted." The lamentable moral condition, or rather immoral degradation, the viciousness and wickedness of all papal countries, show how the wicked walk abroad, and by inference suggest that the rulers who control them, and who give them free opportunity for the exercise of their lusts and evil desires, must be among the vilest of men. Approached from the other side, namely, from the standpoint of the rulers, the truth is obvious, that where those in positions of high authority are vile, there the people on every side will ultimately become wicked. There is an intimate relation between the vileness of rulers and the wickedness of peoples, and a corresponding influence of the wickedness of peoples in encouraging the vileness of rulers. I do not hesitate to say with a frankness which is re-enforced by myriad facts, that the exceeding moral wickedness of the cities of all papal countries is a proof of the vileness of their rulers; and that the hierarchy of Rome, as rulers of the people, have never deserved the commendation which belongs to a high morality, either social, financial, or political. Having stated this with such clearness that I do not think you can mistake my meaning, I call upon you now at the opening of this discourse to remember so far as you can all that they have done, all the depths to which they have degraded the peoples whom they have governed, as a perfect vindication of a characterization which would seem to be too severe, unless you had hitherto been made perfectly aware of the facts which support it.

I desire at this time to show that their prin-

ciples, which have been applied elsewhere, are avowedly in the direction of the control of this Republic; that their purposes are not disguised, but are announced; that the material which they have at hand in this country with which to accomplish their purposes is altogether in accord with the text, and compatible with their designs and purpose, and then to show you finally, that they have already made good their avowals and their boasts, to an extent which might well alarm any but the proudest, the most conceited, the most indifferent, and the most ignorant of American citizens.

I. The principle of the full control of the state by the Pope is freely declared by the Roman Catholics. 1. The great Von Döllinger, at the time when the infallibility decree was pending, said, "If the infallibility of the popes be raised to a principle of faith, another doctrine that has been maintained by the popes since Gregory VII. will also receive the force of a dogma; namely, the doctrine of the submission of monarchs and kingdoms to the dominion of the Holy See, — a dominion which extends over secular and political matters. Every Catholic Christian is thus bound to believe, as a doctrine revealed of God, and which must be taught in every catechism, that the popes possess an absolute power over all princes and authorities; over all states and commonwealths; and that by their sovereign power they can interfere at discretion in all state affairs, depose princes, annul laws, and regulate war and peace. Pope Boniface VIII.'s Bull, 'Unam Sanctam,' is a solemn dogmatic decision, addressed to

the whole church, and declares a belief in all this to be a condition of everlasting salvation. This doctrine was confirmed by Leo X. at the Synod of the Lateran, and a whole series of papal decrees is founded upon it."

Von Döllinger, as most of you know who have heard this series of discourses, was the most eminent scholar and historian in the Roman Catholic Church at the time when he wrote these words. 2. The Romanists affirm the supremacy of the Pope as strongly as the popes themselves have proclaimed it. They declare, without any hesitation, the duty of the people to resist the laws of the nation if those laws are contrary to those of the church. Pope Leo XIII. says, "Furthermore, in politics, which are inseparably bound up with the laws of morality and religious duties, men ought always and in the first place to serve, as far as possible, the interests of Catholicism." Do you get the full force of this claim? "As soon as they" (that is the interests of Catholicism) "are seen to be in danger, all differences should cease between Catholics. The (papal) church cannot grant its patronage or favor to men whom it knows to be hostile to it; who openly refuse to respect its rights; who seek to break the alliance established by the nature of things between religious (papal) interests and the interests of the civil order. On the contrary, its duty is to favor those, who, having sound ideas as to the relations between church and state, wish to make them both harmonize. These principles contain the rule according to which every Catholic ought to model his public life. It must be

considered a duty by Christians (Roman Catholic) to be ruled and guided by the authority and leadership of the bishops, and especially of the Apostolic See. Man's duties, what he ought to believe and what he ought to do, are by divine right laid down by the church and in the church by the Supreme Pontiff.

"If the laws of the state are in open contradiction with the divine law" (that is with the law of the church), "if they command anything prejudicial to the church, or are hostile to the duties imposed by religion, or violate in the person of the Supreme Pontiff the authority of Jesus Christ, then, indeed, it is a duty to resist them and a crime to obey them."

3. What are some of the laws of the church which the Pope declares it is a duty to enforce in the face of all states? I will read from the canon law of the Roman Catholic Church, as taught by Dr. G. F. Von Schulte, professor of Canonical Law at Prague, which contains the following declarations: —

"IV. The Pope has the right to give countries and nations which are non-Catholic to Catholic regents, who can reduce them to slavery."

"V. The Pope can make slaves of those Christian subjects whose prince or ruling power is interdicted by the Pope."

"VII. The Church has the right to practise the unconditional censure of books."

"VIII. The Pope has the right to annul state laws, treaties, constitutions, etc.; to absolve from obedience thereto, as soon as they seem detrimental to the rights of the church or those of the clergy." *I am reading the law of the Roman Catholic Church.*

"IX. The Pope possesses the right of admonishing, and if needs be of punishing, the temporal rulers, emperors, and kings, as well as of drawing before the spiritual forum any case in which a mortal sin occurs.

"X. Without the consent of the Pope no tax or rate of any kind can be levied upon a clergyman, or upon any church whatsoever." Two Sundays ago I was telling about the desirability of taxing church property. Did you know that you cannot tax the church property in this country without the consent of the Pope? (Laughter.)

"XI. The Pope has the right to absolve from oaths, and obedience to the persons and the laws of the princes whom he excommunicates."

"XIII. The Pope can release from every obligation, oath, vow, either before or after being made."

"XIV. The execution of papal commands for the persecution of heretics causes remission of sins."

"XV. He who kills one that is excommunicated is no murderer in a legal sense."

Cardinal Manning, in *Donahoe's Magazine* of December, 1888, says, "It is an obligation to obey the civil ruler; but if the civil ruler shall make a law hostile to (papal) faith we must then be Catholics first and citizens afterwards." In volume III. of Ecclesiastical Sermons, page 83, this same cardinal asks, "Why should the Holy Father touch any matter in politics at all? For this plain reason, because politics are a part of morals. Politics are morals on the widest scale." Moreover, Cardinal Manning gives his indorsement to a book prepared for the use of the Roman Catholic colleges and

schools, by the Rev. F. X. Schouppe, of the Society of the Jesuits, which says (p. 278), "The civil laws are binding on the conscience only so long as they are comformable to the rights of the Catholic Church." And further, Vicar-General Preston, in a sermon preached in New York, January 1, 1888, made this announcement: "Every word Leo speaks from his high chair is the voice of the Holy Ghost, and must be obeyed. To every Catholic heart comes no thought but obedience. It is said that politics is not within the province of the Church, and that the Church has only jurisdiction in matters of faith. You say, 'I will receive my faith from the Pontiff, but I will not receive my politics from him.' This assertion is disloyal and untruthful. You must not think as you choose: you must think as Catholics. The man who says, 'I will take my faith from Peter, but I will not take my politics from Peter,' is not a true Catholic. The Church teaches that the Supreme Pontiff must be obeyed, because he is the vicar of the Lord: Christ speaks through him."

The same doctrine was uttered by priest Bodfish, at a hearing in the State House of Massachusetts, held between the 20th of March and the 25th of April, 1889. In answer to a question by Governor Long, who said, "You are bound to receive, believe, and disseminate the word of the Pope?" he said, "Yes sir," having fully explained it before in terms like the above. Moreover, in the encyclical letter of November 7, 1885, Leo XIII. thus speaks: "Every Catholic should rigidly adhere to the teachings of the Roman Pontiff, especially in the matter of mod-

ern liberty, which, already under the semblance of honesty of purpose, leads to destruction. We exhort all Catholics to devote careful attention to public matters, and take part in all municipal affairs and elections, and all public services, meetings, and gatherings." Then they ought to be here, in this hall. (Laughter.) "All Catholics must make themselves felt as active elements in daily political life in countries where they live. All Catholics should exert their power to cause the constitutions of states to be modelled on the principles of the (Roman Catholic) Church." Perhaps I have read enough of that to make it perfectly clear to you that their principles are distinctly and unequivocally avowed.

4. Now I ask you, in the name of common sense, why do not the American people believe statements like these, when we tell them that therein are embodied the principles and purposes of the papacy; and why do some of you permit my word to be called in question without contradiction, when I have never assumed to state more than has been avowed by the canonical law, the councils and the popes? (Applause.) I speak forth the words of truth and soberness, and that man is a coward or a knave who calls names instead of furnishing most ample contradiction by citation and argument, if such there be. (Applause.) Paul said, "I am not mad," but if he had lived now I do not know but he would have got mad just because he used his reason. (Applause.)

5. Further than this, let me read you where Leo XIII. in his encyclical of January 10, 1890, declares

that "politics are inseparably bound up with the laws of morality and religious duties." This declaration is *ex cathedra*, and therefore infallible the end of controversy to all good Roman Catholics. But the revised Statutes of the United States declare (a little American law may be put in contrast with papal demands): "The alien seeking citizenship must make oath to renounce forever all allegiance and fidelity to any foreign prince, potentate, state, or sovereignty, in particular that to which he has been subject." The Roman Catholic profession of faith, having the sanction of the Council which met at Baltimore in 1884, contains the following oath of allegiance to the Pope: "And I pledge and swear true obedience to the Roman Pontiff, vicar of Jesus Christ, and successor of the blessed Peter, prince of the Apostles." Behold the law of the Republic set at naught by the Romish Council! The Pope claims absolute authority over states, legislatures, laws, and politics. The Roman Catholic swears allegiance to the Pope in all these respects. Hold that steadily in your mind.

Moreover, the supremacy of the Pope is not confined to politics; but, to show you the breadth of his claims, allow me to give one further quotation from his infallible statements. "Familiar Explanation of Catholic Doctrine," by Rev. M. Müller, published by Benziger Bros. in 1888, is a Roman catechism, used in the parochial schools, bearing the imprimatur of Cardinal Gibbons, and strongly commended by many Roman prelates. The following extracts are from No. IV. of the series. "The Pope could not dis-

charge his office as the teacher of all nations unless he were able with infallible certainty to proscribe and condemn doctrines, *logical*, *scientific*, *physical*, *metaphysical*, *or political* of any kind, which are at variance with the Word of God" (which does not mean the Bible, but means the word of the Pope), "and imperil the integrity and purity of the faith" (that is the papal faith), "or the salvation of souls" (which word salvation of souls, of course, is used in their very peculiar sense, as brought about by priests).

6. These avowals of the papacy have been put in practice in Canada to a degree to which they have not as yet been practically applied here. The interference of priest and Jesuit in Canadian politics has come to be much more open than it is in American politics as yet, though we are rapidly nearing their standard and action. On September 22, 1875, the seven bishops of the Roman Catholic Church in Canada issued a pastoral letter on the eve of a pending election, in which they gave certain advice, entirely comformable to all which I have read and cited above, to all their priests and to all their people throughout the Dominion of Canada. These bishops claim absolute political control. They claim that the priests should direct their parishioners how to vote. They declare that the priests should name the candidate, and should direct the people whom to support and whom to reject; and the sole basis of their favor or hostility was to be the friendliness or the hostility of these various candidates to the papal church. Bishop Rogers, of Chatham, one of them, claimed the absolute right of the church, through its pastors, to

direct all politics; and declared that there was no possible independence in the matter, in which he was fully supported by the united pastoral. The bishop's letter was approved at Rome. All these facts and statements, cited in detail, I hold in my hand, with date and place and name extendedly drawn out. The Roman authorities commended the bishops. What happened as a result? The electors in Canada were threatened with excommunication if they should vote differently from what the priests directed; and when these matters were brought before the courts after the election, it was there, under oath, made clear that in some cases the priest had told his people that he and not the elector was responsible for the vote cast: they must vote as he dictated. It was further sworn to by many electors that they voted under the threat of excommunication, and believed that they would be damned in hell if they voted differently from what the priests had commanded them. Mgr. Gaume, of Canada, who issued a catechism concerning liberalism, by which is meant the doctrine in Canada which rejects the excessive claims of the papacy, affirms all the above principles as I have read them, and the archbishop of Canada had the impudence to recently write to a British peer telling him that the church held the balance of power in Canada, and that it would direct that power according to its preferences: let the home government take notice.

7. The above principles are announced with entire unreserve all over the world as the purpose of the papacy. Leo XIII., as I have already read in your

hearing, in 1885 commands the people that they give especial attention to politics. "All Catholics must make themselves felt as active elements in daily political life in countries where they live. If Catholics are idle, the reins of power will easily be gained by persons whose opinions can surely afford little prospect of welfare. Hence, Catholics have just reason to enter into political life: having in mind the purpose in introducing the wholesome life-blood of Catholic wisdom and virtue into the whole system of the state. All Catholics who are worthy of the name must work to the end, that every state be made conformable to the Christian model we have described." That prominent Catholic authority, Dr. Brownson, in his Review for July, 1864, declared: "Undoubtedly it is the intention of the Pope to possess this country. In this intention he is aided by the Jesuits and all the Catholic prelates and priests." Father Hecker in his last work, published in 1887, says: "The Catholics will outnumber, before the close of this century, all other believers in Christianity put together in the republic." Then he warns us to look out for what they will do. In 1853 the editor of the *Freeman's Journal*, D'Arcy Magee, undertook to get the priests of this country to do what they could to take the poor Irish Roman Catholics out of great cities, and to spread them over the fertile lands of the West; but, as one of the priests of that time present in the Buffalo Convention tells us, they all opposed this idea, saying their policy was not to scatter but to bring together their forces in the great cities, and at strategic points to make the assault which would issue in the downfall

of American liberty. That convention was held nearly forty years ago, and they have been as good as their word since, as you and I will see before my address closes.

8. Manifestly in all this, there is great peril to the nation. May I quote a word from a most eminent living English historian, namely, James Anthony Froude, who, discoursing on the subject "What a Catholic Majority could do in America," says, "Every true Catholic is bound to think and act as his priest tells him, and a Republic of true Catholics becomes a theocracy administered by the clergy. It is only as long as they are a small minority that they can be loyal subjects under such a constitution as the American. As their numbers grow, they will assert their principles more and more. Give them the power, and the Constitution will be gone. A Catholic majority, under spiritual direction, will forbid liberty of worship, and will try to forbid liberty of conscience. It will control education: it will put the press under surveillance: it will punish opposition with excommunication, and excommunication will be attended with civil disabilities." Surely the calm and learned opinion of a great historian is deserving of consideration, especially when he speaks in harmony with all that we know from a thousand years of history.

II. But some of you listening have been saying, "What if these are their principles? They can never apply or enforce them." Have you considered what material they have for enforcing them? Have you considered the army which is at their back in their attempt to make these ideas practical? If not, bear with

me while I marshal that army before you. You know the character of the following of the Roman Catholic priests in this city. You know how the priests and their people follow the bishop. You know how those bishops and their dioceses follow the cardinals, and you know that the cardinals are the creatures of the Pope. These are the officers and the privates of their army of aggression. Let us look at the agents by whom they hope to win their victories and accomplish their purposes.

At the head of these are the Pope, the cardinals, the archbishops, the bishops, and the priests. The rank and file who obey them are a vast host.

1. First of all they rely in this country for the accomplishment of their purposes to subordinate the state on foreigners: on not merely those who were born in foreign countries, but those who are essentially foreign in every respect. The present transplanting of the French Romanist from the Province of Quebec into New England and the United States is one of the marvellous movements of the last few years. One of the most distinguished doctors of divinity in New England has recently written an article in one of our leading magazines, in which he distinctly says that the coming of these hosts of Canadians is believed to be a part of the direct purpose of the priests to subvert civil government in this country, and he is not an alarmist either. This opinion is entertained by intelligent Canadian Protestants and French Protestants in the United States. There are said to be four hundred thousand French Canadians in New England, and a million and a quarter in the United States.

Almost all of them are papists. Nearly every one of them is a follower of the priests. It is not easy to tell accurately how many there are, but there is no difficulty in determining where they stand in this great conflict. The Ninety-third Annual Report of the Home Missionary Society of the State of Massachusetts reveals the following among other facts about French Canadians in the State of Massachusetts. Here is a table taken from the French Guide of the United States, which shows us that in this, our own Worcester County, there are at least six towns in which the French Canadians number from fifty to sixty-one per cent of the entire population. "Take a group of nine towns in Worcester County,— Douglas, Webster, Spencer, Southbridge, Sutton, Brookfield, West Boylston, North Brookfield, and Millbury, — and, out of a total population of 41,395, there are 20,642 French Canadians, or one-half. Add Worcester and Fitchburg, with a joint population of 106,692, and you have added 19,819 French Canadians, so that your proportion is still more than one-quarter. It is twenty-seven per cent. It is believed, upon reliable information, that these figures give an understatement of the number of French Canadians. These figures give some sense of the proportions of the French Canadian problem — a problem that will grow on our hands as the years go on. And it does not concern Massachusetts alone of the New England States; for while by these figures, which are probably too small, we have 7 1-2 per cent French Canadians, Maine has 8 per cent, New Hampshire 12 per cent, Vermont 9 1-2 per cent, Connecticut 3 7-10 per cent, and Rhode Island

10 4-5 per cent. As a whole, the percentage in New England is 7 4-5 per cent.

"These are relied upon as a part of the foreign army of the Pope in the United States. But suppose you turn to the great cities, and observe the nationality of the people who are in them controlled politically by the priests and their servants. In the city of New York, Mayor Hewitt declares, in a message which he himself prepared, that according to the census of 1880, 39 1-2 per cent of the people were foreign born, and an additional 40 1-2 per cent were born of foreign parentage; in the city of New York, therefore, he says more than 80 per cent of the people are foreigners. There are thirty-seven nationalities speaking eighty different dialects." All these are voting according to their numbers. See the enormous power of foreigners in New York, many of whom, I admit, are good and reliable American citizens, but many of whom are not; and a large proportion are the blind slaves of the papal purposes.

2. Not only do the priests confidently rely upon the foreigners, but they as confidently rely on the illiterate. Three-fourths of the French Canadians cannot read and write. They are therefore all the more reliable for priestly purposes. What are the facts about illiteracy as fostered and exploited by the priests of Rome? There are numerous Roman Catholic countries which have been such for centuries that are more illiterate than China. In China fifty per cent are illiterate, but in Hungary fifty-one per cent, in Chili seventy-three, in Poland ninety-one, in Mexico ninety-three, in Spain eighty, in Venezuela ninety, in

Brazil eighty-four, in Portugal eighty-two, — so many out of a hundred people cannot read and write. Rome has to rely upon the people who cannot read and write for her power. (Applause.) This is why she hates our common schools. (Great Applause.)

3. But does Rome rely on the illiterate, she also relies upon the criminals. I say this without hesitation, because it is abundantly capable of proof. I am only afraid that I shall give you so much proof as to weary you. As illustrative of the walking of the wicked on every side when the priests are exalted: "A recent number of *El Solfeo*, an Italian journal of prominence, furnishes the following statistics: In 1870, that is before Rome was the capital of the kingdom of Italy, there were in the city (for a population of 205,000 inhabitants) 2,469 secular clergy, among cardinals, bishops, prelates, and cures; 2,766 monks and 2,117 nuns; in all, 7,322 religious of both sexes. The number of births reached in the same year to 4,378, of which 1,215, were legitimate, and 3,163 illegitimate; the illegitimates, therefore, being in the proportion of 75.25 per 100 of the total of births. Comparing Rome with other capitals of Europe, it results that, for every 100 legitimate births, there are illegitimate: in London, 4; in Paris, 48; in Brussels, 9; in Rome, 143. Nor in regard to capital crime did the Pontifical states occupy a favorable position before they were annexed to Italy by King Victor Emanuel. The statistics corresponding to the latest years of the Pontifical government show that there was committed one murder in England for every 187,000 inhabitants; in Holland, one for every 168,000; in Russia, one for

every 100,000; in Austria, one for every 4,113; in Naples, one for every 2,750; and in the estates of the Pope, one for every 750." Compare that with the 187,000 of England. "A recent English paper says that the Roman Catholics in Scotland are less than one-twelth of the population, yet this one-twelth furnishes one-third of the criminals. In England and Wales, the Roman Catholics are one-twentieth of the population; but the Roman Catholic prisoners are one-fourth of all prisoners." This is merely introductory to an array of figures which I have here, gathered and indorsed by so eminent an authority as the late Dr. Littledale of the Anglican Church. (See "Littledale's Plain Reasons, Against joining the Church of Rome," pp. 203, 4, 5, as follows:)

"On December 31, 1877, there were 4,289 criminal Protestant children detained in English reformatories, and 1,346 Roman Catholic ones, more than 24 per cent; in Clerkenwell prison, during 1877-8, there were 1,395 Roman Catholics out of 8,930, more than 16 per cent; in Wandsworth, 1,006 Roman Catholics out of 6,472, nearly 16 per cent; in Coldbath Fields during 1877, 23 1-4 per cent. The ratio in Manchester for 1877–8–9 has been 43 per cent; in one of the Liverpool jails 50 per cent and upwards; and in the other, for 1871–79, 67 per cent of Roman Catholic prisoners, more than double all others together, the ratio of Roman Catholics in Liverpool, where they are denser than anywhere else in England, being 27.1 per cent in 1881. In Scotland, Roman Catholics are about 8 1-2 per cent of the population, chiefly collected in Dundee and Glasgow. Their ratio of criminals in

the jail of Dundee was 38 per cent; and in Glasgow 44 1-3 per cent, in 1879. In Ireland, where Roman Catholics are 76.6 per cent of the population, their share of the crime in 1881–2 was 33,424 convicts out of a total of 38,968, or 86 per cent, which included, moreover, nearly all the serious offences, as the remaining 14 per cent consisted almost exclusively of petty offenders. In the Dominion of Canada Roman Catholics are much less than half the total population, the census of 1881 returning 1,791,982 of them out of 4,324,810, say 44 per cent; but in 1880 they had 10,286 criminals, against 9,304 of all other denominations, or 52 per cent of the total. The figures are more remarkable in the province of Ontario, where there were in 1881 almost equal numbers of Roman Catholics and Anglicans -- 320,839 of the former and 366,539 of the latter. But the Roman Catholic criminals in 1880 were 4,152, as against 1,944 Anglicans; much more than double the natural ratio. In Prussia, where the Roman Catholics are one-third (33.3 per cent) of the whole population, and not so relatively poor as in England, they produced, in 1870, 52.6 per cent of the criminals brought to trial; in 1871, 56.7 per cent; in 1872, 56.3 per cent; in 1873, 58.2 per cent; in 1874, 57 per cent; in 1875, 63.5 per cent; in 1876, 67.5 per cent; in 1877, 60.7 per cent; in 1878, 63.7 per cent. What is more, a heavier proportion holds for the graver crimes. In 1878 the Roman Catholic murderers charged were 18.7 per cent more than the Protestant ones; homicides were 53.5 per cent; assaults, with fatal results, 38.6 per cent; poisoning, 100 per

cent; serious and repeated cases of theft, 30 per cent; robbery and extortion, 36 per cent; common larceny, 49.8 per cent; in excess of the Protestant criminals. In The Netherlands, where the Roman Catholic element is over one-third of the population, there were (omitting all petty offenders), in 1877, 4.85 criminals in every thousand Protestants, but 5.34 in every thousand Roman Catholics; in 1878 the figures were: Protestants, 4.87, Roman Catholics, 5.27; in 1879, Protestants, 4.78, Roman Catholics, 5.39; in 1880, Protestants, 4.73, Roman Catholics, 5.29." In Australia the following witness is borne by Sir Archibald Michie, Q.C., Agent-General for Victoria, and formerly Attorney-General there, in his "Readings in Melbourne," p. 194 (London, 1879): "In nothing are Mr. Hayter's statistics more interesting than in the tables showing the relative number of arrests and convictions among the different religious sects. The Roman Catholics are on a most unenviable eminence in this respect. 'In proportion to their numbers in the community,' writes Mr. Hayter, 'the Roman Catholics supplied more than twice as many arrested persons as the Protestants, and more than three times as many as the Jews and the Pagans. In view of a similar proportion, fewer Protestants were committed for trial than were members of any other of the sects distinguished. The total number of criminals executed from 1861 to 1876 was forty-one . . . Twelve of these forty-one were of the Church of England, twenty-one were Roman Catholics, two Presbyterians, three Wesleyans, and three Pagans. Thirty-six were cases of murder, and the

residue capital cases of other kinds.' Now, bearing in mind that the proportion of the Catholic population to the Protestant was for many years less than a fourth, the above statement is a very startling one. No census has been taken since 1871; but the estimated number of all the Protestants in the year 1876 was 610,469, and of the Roman Catholics, 198,067. The Roman Catholics thus, even now, number only between a third and a fourth of the population. In the United States, the comparative results are alleged to be of the same character, but the system of prison returns does not admit of tabulating them."

These are most striking and threatening figures; they show that everywhere Romanism is prolific of crime, that where the papacy rules conscience is debauched, morality degraded, and criminality encouraged by the policy of the Roman Catholic Church. And when, therefore, I say that Rome relies in this great warfare against our liberties on criminals whom she has made such, I state facts without passion which are borne out by the statistics of the world.

4. Take a view in our own State of Massachusetts, for we want to know the facts near home as well as far away. Of 665 prisoners in the State Prison of Massachusetts in 1885, 312 were Irish. I see no reason in the world why the Irish people should be criminal, excepting that they are debauched by popery. The Irishmen of the north of Ireland, of Ulster, of the cities of Belfast and Londonderry, being largely Protestants, are not prolific in criminals. When I speak of the Irish Roman Catholic crimi-

nals of Massachusetts and read these figures, God knows I have no race prejudice. The Irish people are as dear to me as any people in the world, but when I see them turned into criminals by a false system of religion, I may state the facts and resent the causes. (Applause.)

In Massachusetts in 1885, of 3,426 in prisons, 1,377 had one or both parents born in Ireland; of 3,246 in prisons, only 257 had both their parents born in Massachusetts; of 8,394 paupers, 5,320 had Irish parents; of 122,263 illiterate, 13,898 were native born, while 108,365 were foreign born. Nineteen per cent of the people in Massachusetts in 1885 who could not read and write were Canadian, fifty-five per cent were Irish, and only two and eight one-hundreths of the illiterates of Massachusetts were born of parents who were natives of this State. Do I not say well, when I survey even our own State, that the Roman Catholic Church is depending on the least competent and least moral elements of society to govern the state, which she has avowed her purpose to rule, and that she makes and marshals law-breakers to annul our laws?

5. But they are also relying on something else; on what? They are relying on military societies, which they are forming all over this country, under the sanction of the priests.

Do you want to know the names of some of them, military and semi-military? The Ancient Order of Hibernians, Irish American Society, Knights of St. Patrick, St. Paul's Cadets, Apostles of Liberty, Knights of the Red Branch, Knights of St. Peter,

Benevolent Sons of the Emerald Isle, Knights of Columbkill, the Clan-na-Gael, which has a horrible history in this country; and of late they are relying to some extent on the Knights of Labor, in so far as they have given their allegiance to Cardinal Gibbons and the Pope. In our own city there are military companies composed exclusively of Irish Roman Catholics and armed with Winchester rifles. I want to ask you if our militia are armed with Winchester rifles; and if they are not I want to know who gave these Winchester rifles, the best arms in the military service, to the Irish Roman Catholics? May I ask who would give Winchester rifles to Methodists and Congregationalists, if they should arm for the public defence? If I were, as I am not, a member of the Order of United American Mechanics, I would buy guns and learn how to use them (Loud applause), not because I desire to precipitate conflict, but for the precisely opposite reason, because I desire to make conflict impossible by furnishing a national police who are not in subordination to the Pope of Rome. (Applause.) When I observe these military and semi-military companies; when I know that a very large proportion of the police of great cities are of the same nationality, in the same ecclesiastical relation, and all dominated by the priests, I see in it all a fixed plan to precipitate a catastrophe for American liberty. (Applause.)

But, you say, what does all this amount to? I answer, it amounts to this, that Gregory XVI. said there was no place in the world where he was pope so much as he was in America. Pius IX. uttered

the same sentiment. Leo XIII. confidently relies upon the same supposition. It reminds me, friends, that in every other land on the globe the Roman Catholic hierarchy is looked upon with suspicion, and watched as an enemy, save in the United States, where it is blind-folding the people and arming the assassins of liberty. (Sensation and cheers.) Well, you say, all this in way of preparation.

III. What have they accomplished? That is what I will now tell you. We know something of what they have done in other lands. We know how they obstruct government in other countries, and furnish untold trouble for those who are endeavoring to bring in light, liberty, and righteous law. What have they done? "When in May, 1851, New Grenada proclaimed religious toleration, and subjected the clergy to the secular courts, Pius IX., in the allocution 'Acerbissimum,' of September 27, 1852, pronounced the laws to be null and void, and threatened heavy ecclesiastical penalties on all who should dare to enforce them. . . . When, in 1855, Mexico adopted a constitution embodying the same principles, Pius, in the allocution 'Nunquam fore,' December 15, 1856, annulled the Constitution and forbade obedience to it. When, about the same time, Spain made an effort in the same direction, the allocution 'Nemo vestrum,' of July 24, 1855, similarly abrogated the obnoxious provisions. Even a powerful empire like that of Austria fared no better when, in December, 1867, it decreed liberty of conscience and of the press, and in May, 1868, adopted a law of civil marriage; for the allocution 'Nunquam certe,' of June 22, 1868, denounced all

these as atrocious laws, and declared them to be void and of no effect." All this, be it remembered, transpired in modern times, within the memory of young men here present. I need not advert to Canada, but pass directly to our own country. What have they done?

1. They have already secured control of all the strategic points in America. Notice in New York city where everything is subordinate to the papacy, politically, morally, and financially. The mayor, Hugh J. Grant, publicly knelt to Corrigan, the archbishop, before a great audience, in a public hall, in March of 1892, and kissed the prelate's hand, in token of submission. This Mayor Grant, says the New York *Times*, cannot compose and write a respectable English letter to save his life. A list of the municipal officers of the city of New York shows to what an extent they have gained control. From the New York *Mail* and *Express*, November 7, 1888, I read: "The Roman Catholics have taken the city. Their hand was in the sale of the Coogan party to Hugh J. Grant. They already have every member of the Board of Tax Commissioners. They have for years had and still have the control of the Board of Aldermen. They have the Mayor, the Sheriff, the Comptroller, the Counsel to the Corporation, the whole Board of Tax Assessors, the Commissioner of Public Works, the Superintendent of the Street Cleaning Department" (I should think so from the looks of the streets) (Laughter), "the Clerk to the Board of Aldermen, the Superintendent of the Bureau of Elections, several of the Justices of the Supreme,

Superior, and Common Pleas Courts, the control of the Board of Estimate and Apportionment, the majority in many of the ward boards of School Trustees, a large portion of the Board of Education, the control of the Department of Charities and Corrections, the majority in the police force, the control of the Fire Department, of the Board of Street Openings, the whole of the Armory Board, the Register of Deeds, the Commissioner of Jurors, one half of the Commissioners of Accounts, Supervisor of the City Record, the Collector of the Port, the Sub-Treasury, majority of the Commissioners of the Sinking Fund, the majority of the delegation in Congress and in the State Senate and Assembly." Is not New York in their power?

What is the character of some of these officers? You have all heard, I suppose, the names of some of them as bosses, criminals, etc. In political conventions they have been very prominently before the country for the last two weeks, for what New York State may do politically means what the bosses of both parties are going to do in the city of New York, and these bosses are all on their knees to the Roman Catholic power. Commenting on the personal character of these rulers, the New York *World* says, "Thomas Dunlap, a commissioner of jurors, with a salary of fifteen thousand dollars a year, began life as a dog-catcher, gained influence as a rum-seller, and passed from a gin-mill to a position where he practically has charge of the jury-system of the city. Four aldermen keep one or two saloons each, and two of them keep 'bucket-shops' and 'all-night' dens. Rich-

ard Crocker, coroner, with twelve thousand dollars a year, has been a prize-fighter, and only escaped conviction for the crime of murder through his influence in Tammany counsels." "Richard Flanigan, another coroner at twelve thousand dollars a year, has been a prize-fighter and is a gambler. Jerry Hartigan, another member of the committee, has been tried for murder. The list might be extended, but a few shining examples suffice to show what a city may expect which allows itself to be governed" by the Roman Catholic hierarchy. As to the financial management which they give to the city of New York, we have it stated that within a few years, the Roman Catholics have obtained three and a half million dollars worth of real estate from the city, without purchase or payment; that in eleven years they have received $6,000,000; that in 1868 they took $710,000; in 1879, $693,000; that in seventeen years they have received nearly $11,000,000. The late distinguished Rev. Dr. Crosby had a worthy son, a representative at Albany, who says that about $600,000 annually are taken from the treasury of the State of New York appropriated to the following denominational uses: $25,000 to Jews, $65,000 to Protestants, $510,000 to Roman Catholics.

The taxes in the city of New York are greater per capita than in any other great city in the world, so far as I know. In that city under papal government the cost per capita is more than $36.00, in Brooklyn less than $11.00 (I give the even dollars; I have the cents also here, but you need not mind the cents when Rome's hand is in the treasury, for she does not count them), in Albany $13.00, in Philadelphia $16.00, in

Buffalo $10.00, in Baltimore $10.00, in Cincinnati $14.00, in Cleveland $8.00, in Chicago $16.00, in Detroit $11.00, in St. Paul $6.00, in Milwaukee $6.00, in St. Louis $14.00; and in London it costs $7.50, only one-fifth of what it costs in New York; in Paris $5.40 one-seventh of the New York rate, in Berlin $7.35, per capita about the same as London. This is what they are doing, what they have already done. a glimpse of their financiering with taxpayers. You wanted to know what they accomplish; I am telling you. We know that the influence of New York city has been final and controlling in national politics. Of this I need not speak at length on the present occasion. The great political parties have both, in their recent conventions, declared for Home Rule in Ireland; I hope they have not declared for Rome Rule in America. (Applause.) It looks very much as if they had.

2. But now for Boston, our own imperial Boston, the Boston which we glory in as the modern Athens, which is in danger of becoming modern Cork (Applause); the Boston which we remember as associated with the earliest struggles of American liberty, and which may be associated with its latest conflicts; the Boston which we once thought of as possessing the most eminent names of the foremost citizens and leading literary men of the country; the Boston of Samuel Adams and Warren and Hancock, of Charles Sumner and Wendell Phillips. (Applause.) What of Boston? The population in 1848 was 128,000; it then had sixty-five police. The population in 1888 had increased *four* fold, and the police had to be increased *thirteen* fold.

This tells you something of the kind of people who are filling it up. It is because Boston population has changed greatly and is very different to-day from what it was formerly that this great addition to its police has been made necessary. How about the government of the city of Boston, the men and the money? Twenty-five years ago, in 1866, when Mr. F. W. Lincoln was mayor of the city of Boston, there were but six Roman Catholics in the city government. To-day there are over fifty such. Forty years ago nearly all the money which was paid out of the public treasury was paid to officers with American names and Protestant lineage. To-day, of about six million dollars paid out of the treasury, nearly five and a half million is paid to Roman Catholics, in sums varying from six thousand dollars a year down to day wages. Four thousand and more of the employees of the city of Boston are Roman Catholics, who pay tax to the priests. Boston to-day is almost a Roman Catholic city. In 1888 Mayor O'Brien closed its public library on St. Patrick's Day. This is very suggestive, for saints' days and all which they involve have closed up the public intelligence of many a nation, and would do the same in this country if Rome had its way.

3. But what I have said of Boston is just as true of New England at large. What I have said of Massachusetts is the peril through all this little cluster of sister States. *Donahoe's Magazine* for June, 1888, calls Connecticut an Irish commonwealth, and says the Irish are in practical control of the state. As they said it in the way of boast, it cannot be offensive

for me to state it as a fact. As you might infer from the name, DONAHOE'S *Magazine* is edited by an Irishman and a Roman Catholic. This article names the members of the legislature, the mayors, and members of the city government in the nine cities of Bridgeport, Hartford, Meriden, Middletown, New Britain, New Haven, New London, South Norwalk, and Waterbury. I had those names before me when I made these notes which I am reading. Proceeding, it says, "Let the grand roll of the towns be called, and let further evidence be adduced to show that in Connecticut at least, the term New England has become a misnomer, and that the term New Ireland has incontrovertible claims to present and future recognition." Further, in a later issue, May, 1889, it says that the Roman Catholic is the leading form of worship in New England. It quotes Boston and its officers as proof; says that Holyoke and Springfield are all officered by Irish, from mayors to justices of the peace. Rhode Island is one-half Irish by birth and extraction, and three-fifths of its population foreigners. New Haven is officered mostly by Irish. New England is no longer New England. Ah, you say, I cannot believe that. But you cannot deny facts; and I think the facts are as stated by them. Here is further proof. The superintendent of the religious census of the United States, in an article in the June number of the Forum, 1892 (p. 532), says, "There are a million communicants in the Catholic church in those six states (New England), against 230,000 in the Congregational churches. This is one of the striking results of immigration and migration;

for while immigration has brought Catholics in, migration has taken Congregationalists out to other parts of the country, particularly to the great West. NEW ENGLAND IS ROMAN CATHOLIC." These are the words of the superintendent of the religious census of the United States, based on figures. You ask what Roman Catholics have done: this is my answer. The Roman Catholic strength in the territories is such that in the remaining territories of the United States they have four times the strength of the Protestants. In California, as compared with the Protestants, they are about four to one. You ask what they have done. They have avowed their purpose to control; what have they done? They have done as they promised. They have captured every strategic point in the United States; they have subjugated our cities; they have throttled our newpapers; they have debauched our politicians; they have robbed our treasuries; they have stabbed our common schools; and are advancing to complete control in this nation as fast as they can; for what I have said of New York and of Boston and of Connecticut cities, is true in large proportion of Baltimore, of Chicago, of Cleveland, of Milwaukee, of Washington in the District of Columbia, and of many another city of the United States. I do not object to the nationality of any man, as I have often said; but while I live I shall object to the control of the papacy in this Republic. (Applause.)

The story of Samson is full of suggestion. Consecrated to God from his birth, he let grow his luxuriant locks as a sign of his devotion to Jehovah. He

was the hope of his nation and the scourge of her enemies. The love of ease and the lust of pleasure led him to lay his head in a harlot's lap. She treacherously sought for the secret of his power for many a day, but in vain. At length she learned it; and when she had sheared from his head the only sign left to show that he recognized, even in his sin, a divine allegiance, she cried with the voice with which she had lulled him to sleep, now a voice of terrible threatening, "The Philistines be upon thee, Samson." And blind and chained, the last hope of Israel ground in the prison-house, while his enemies made sport. Only at his death was he avenged. The American Samson, with the locks indicative of a divine allegiance on his mighty head, has been seduced from highest aims and noblest purposes, as they were handed down to him by the fathers, and drawn aside for gold and ease and political power, has laid his head in the Roman harlot's lap. There she soothes him with honeyed lies, enchains him with her lasciviousness, and beguiles him with her designs. And though he knows that she has brought low Spain and Italy and Portugal and Austria, though he knows that she has made Mexico to grind, a slave and blind, and has put out the eyes of all the South American states,—knowing all this, confident in his mighty strength, he still carelessly rests his head on her knees. No sooner shall she have sheared away the locks of his majesty, but she proposes to cry to the illiterates, the foreigners, the criminals, the hierarchs, "Enter;" and to him, her victim, no more the giant of the West, she will hiss, "The Philistines be upon

thee, Samson." Anticipating her foul purposes, mindful of the fathers who gave him birth, remembering his high destiny and the duties he owes to the world, we rush into the presence where he lies in ignominy listening to the poison distilling from her lips, and we cry, "The Philistines be upon thee, Samson." Thank God he has not yet lost his crown or his manly power: Methinks I see him leaping up from his dangerous dalliance, rising to a majesty which no nation on this earth has yet attained. He shakes himself unshackled as he bounds to his feet. The glow of intelligence is in his eye, the warnings of history ring in his ears, the voice of God thrills in his heart, and grasping the weapons that a freeman knows how to use, I believe that the already alarmed and stirring Samson of the West will crush the papacy forever, and in her overthrow emancipate the world. (Loud and repeated applause.)

SPECIAL PRICES TO PATRIOTIC MEN AND ORDERS Who will Aid in Scattering our Publications.

(For Regular Prices see last page.)

ROMANISM AND THE REPUBLIC, cloth, 50 cts.;
ROMANISM AND THE REFORMATION, cloth, 50 cts.;
THE TWO SIDES OF THE SCHOOL QUESTION, 6 cts.
THE PAROCHIAL SCHOOL, 4 cts.

THE PUBLIC SCHOOL,
THE POPE IN POLITICS,
THE FUTURE OF ROMANISM,
All Envelope Size, 32 pp. — 8 copies for a silver dime. 100 " " $1.00.

OUR 4-PAGE LEAFLETS, now 19 in number, and said by "workers" in our late election in Boston to be the "best" they ever had for general distribution, 50 cts. per 100, or $3.00 per 1000.

NATIONAL DANGER IN ROMANISM.
A series of 12 Patriotic Addresses.
Single copies, 5 cents. 100 " $3.00 1000 " $25.00
Each mailed to a different address if desired.

* **NOW** is the time to scatter McGlynn's addresses, "The Public Schools" and "The Pope in Politics." If you wish us to mail them direct to Catholics, send **two silver dimes** for every ten names sent us and we will mail at once to **each** name the **two** addresses.

All prices are by mail or express, prepaid. Address

ARNOLD PUBLISHING ASSOCIATION, BOSTON, MASS.

Deacidified using the Bookkeeper process.
Neutralizing agent: Magnesium Oxide
Treatment Date: Jan. 2006

PreservationTechnologies
A WORLD LEADER IN PAPER PRESERVATION
111 Thomson Park Drive
Cranberry Township, PA 16066
(724) 779-2111

BX1770

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 017 285 725 5